NOTE

This Microfiche meets the quality requirements of the American National Standard for Microfiche of Documents (ANSI PH5.9-1975). However, because of imperfections in the document from which it was made, it contains images that are illegible or difficult to read. The source document for this microfiche is the best copy that could be obtained prior to filming.

Congressional Information Service, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

CIS

THE MADRID CSCE REVIEW MEETING

Compiled and Edited by the Staff
of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

Washington, D.C. November, 1983

J 892-4

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE
Room 237, House Annex #2
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Commissioners

REP. DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida, Chairman
SEN. ROBERT DOLE, Kansas, Co-Chairman

REP. SIDNEY YATES, Illinois
REP. TIMOTHY WIRTH, Colorado
REP. EDWARD MARKEY, Massachusetts
REP. DON RITTER, Pennsylvania
REP. CHRIS SMITH, New Jersey

SEN. ORRIN HATCH, Utah
SEN. JOHN HEINZ, Pennsylvania
SEN. ALFONSE D'AMATO, New York
SEN. CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
SEN. PATRICK LEAHY, Vermont

Executive Branch

THE HON. ELLIOTT ABRAMS, Department of State
THE HON. RICHARD NORMAN PERLE, Department of Defense
(VACANT), Department of Commerce

Commission Staff

R. SPENCER OLIVER, Staff Director and General Counsel
SAMUEL WISE, Deputy Staff Director

DEBORAH BURNS, Office Mgr.
CATHERINE COSMAN, Staff Asst.
LYNNE DAVIDSON, Staff Asst.
OREST DEYCHAKIWSKY, Staff Asst.
MEG DONOVAN, Staff Asst.
BARBARA EDWARDS, Admin. Asst.

LESLIE FARRELL, Librarian
JOHN FINERTY, Staff Asst.
ROBERT HAND, Staff Asst.
MYRON HOFFMANN, Press Officer
YALE RICHMOND, Staff Consultant
MARTIN SLETZINGER, Staff Analyst

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	i
The Madrid Meeting: An Analysis	1
The Madrid Concluding Document: A Look at the Main Provisions	11
Names Mentioned by the United States Delegation to the Madrid Meeting of the CSCE	22
Speeches Made by the United States Delegation to the Madrid Meeting of the CSCE:	
Addendum A: Opening Address by U.S. Delegation Chairman Griffin Bell, November 13, 1980	29
Addendum B: Statement by Rep. Dante B. Fascell, Vice-chairman, U.S. Delegation, November 24, 1980 ..	36
Addendum C: Statement by Secretary of State Alexander Haig, February 9, 1982	41
Addendum D: Statement by Senator Robert Dole, Vice-chairman, U.S. Delegation, November 23, 1982 ..	46
Addendum E: Statement by Ambassador Max M. Kampelman, Chairman, U.S. Delegation, July 18, 1983	51
Addendum F: Concluding Speech by Secretary of State George Shultz, September 9, 1983	57
Concluding Document of the Madrid CSCE Review Meeting	64

Foreword

After nearly three years of difficult, often acrimonious negotiations, the Madrid follow-up review conference concluded its work on September 9, 1983 amidst the crisis provoked by the Soviet destruction of an unarmed Korean Airlines passenger plane. The Madrid conference was the second review meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, a process initiated when the heads of state of 33 European nations, the U.S and Canada signed the Helsinki Final Act on August 1, 1975. This document covers nearly every aspect of East-West relations including human rights, human contacts, military security, trade and the free flow of information.

This report of the Madrid review meeting contains four sections: an analysis of the meeting, its accomplishments and difficulties together with an assessment of the 38-page concluding document adopted at the close of the meeting; a listing of the 119 human rights cases raised by the U.S. delegation to the meeting; six speeches given by members of the U.S. delegation at various points during the meeting; and the full text of the concluding document. The Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe in publishing these documents seeks to inform members of Congress, the public and the media of the significant results of the recently completed Madrid conference and to generate a wider appreciation for the goals, potentialities and accomplishments of the CSCE process.

The Helsinki process and meetings like Madrid have been useful in providing unique and timely opportunities to hold the Soviet Union and other countries publicly accountable for actions -- including those involving human rights, Afghanistan, Poland and the Korean Airlines shooting -- which violate international commitments to which their governments have freely subscribed. The vigorous, often highly contested, review of implementation conducted at Madrid and the 1977-78 meeting in Belgrade has served to elevate the issue of human rights to one of legitimate diplomatic concern. These meetings have helped to establish the principle that a government's treatment of its own citizens has an important bearing on that government's relations with other countries.

The lengthy Madrid concluding document builds upon the foundations laid in Helsinki eight years ago. It calls for renewed efforts to guarantee respect for human rights and contains new initiatives in the military security field as well as for combatting terrorism, economic cooperation and the free flow of people and information.

In view of the blatant disregard the Eastern countries have demonstrated for existing commitments in the Helsinki Final Act, it might well be asked why there has been agreement to new undertakings with the Soviets at Madrid. One answer is that by setting higher universal standards for human rights, there is greater hope that someday the general level of performance will also be raised. The words of Madrid, coupled with the pledges of Helsinki, set undisputed standards by which all 35 signatories to the Final Act agree to be judged. Without such standards and the forums to judge them, our ability to hold the Soviet Union and its allies accountable for their deeds would be severely lacking. This would be a particularly grievous calamity for the victims of repression in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe who look to the Western world for their only hope of support with their own governments.

Sincerely,

DANTE B. FASCELL
Chairman

ROBERT DOLE
Co-chairman

The Madrid Meeting - An Analysis

The second follow-up meeting of the 35-nation Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) finally came to a close on September 9, 1983, nearly three years after the deliberations began on November 11, 1980. Burdened throughout by sharply deteriorating East-West relations -- the result of the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan, the imposition of martial law in Poland and continuing Soviet human rights abuses -- the Madrid Meeting served to focus international attention on Soviet actions which violated the letter and spirit of the Helsinki Final Act. Even the formal closing week of the meeting was overshadowed by yet another Soviet atrocity -- the shooting down of a Korean commercial airliner with the loss of 269 lives.

Review meetings like Madrid and its predecessor in Belgrade (October 1977 - March 1978) have a three-fold function: a review of the implementation records of the 35 participating states, the consideration of new proposals to enhance the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and the adoption of a concluding document. The review of implementation at Madrid was frequently heated, at times tempestuous. Continuing East-West tensions over human rights and other issues determined that the consideration of new proposals and the adoption of a concluding document would necessarily be a protracted affair. While it did not take consensus to criticize implementation failures, CSCE procedures require unanimous consent of all 35 signatory states for agreement to a concluding document. The gulf between East and West was such, particularly on the key issues of human rights and military security, that more than two years of negotiations were necessary to produce the compromise concluding document. The length of these negotiations was also heavily conditioned by external events such as Poland and Afghanistan which had a strong negative effect on the proceedings.

The Preparatory Meeting

That Madrid would be a particularly difficult meeting was already evident at the very start during the nine-week preparatory session held from September to November 1980. Originally envisioned to last two to three weeks, the preparatory session was still in deliberation at midnight on November 10, 1980, with the main conference slated to open the next day. The inability to reach agreement on an agenda and procedures was largely the result of Soviet efforts to deny the West sufficient opportunity to conduct a thorough and orderly review of implementation. Repeated Soviet refusal to agree to procedural arrangements based on the Belgrade model led to fears that Moscow had decided to scuttle the CSCE process.

Finally, four days after the main meeting had begun, the Soviets agreed to procedures closely resembling those used at Belgrade, i.e., a separate phase for the review of implementation and deliberations conducted both in plenaries and specialized working groups, one for each "basket" or section of the Final Act. In return, the West agreed to a small reduction in the length of the formal review period and to dropping the provision automatically providing for the next CSCE review meeting.

The Review of Implementation

For nearly six weeks, from November through December 1980, the signatory states conducted an in-depth and contentious review of the state of implementation of the provisions of the Final Act with special attention focused on Eastern human rights violations and the invasion of Afghanistan. While this phase formally ended shortly before Christmas 1980, in fact the consideration of implementation questions continued throughout the entire three years of the meeting. The human rights and other violations resulting from the imposition of martial law in Poland and the banning of the free trade union Solidarity, along with continuing Soviet repression, imprisonment of human rights activists and the occupation of Afghanistan, were themes to which Western delegations, and particularly the U.S., turned repeatedly.

Specifically, the U.S. delegation, headed for the first few months by former Attorney General Griffin Bell and for the remainder of the meeting by Ambassador Max M. Kampelman, made explicit reference to some 119 individuals in Warsaw Pact countries whose Helsinki-guaranteed rights had been in one way or another violated. (A comprehensive listing of these 119 cases is contained in a separate annex to this report.) A large number of these were members of the Moscow, Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Georgian and Armenian Helsinki Monitoring Groups in the USSR, the Charter '77 organization in Czechoslovakia and Solidarity in Poland. The U.S. delegation cited the cases of such well-known dissidents as Anatoly Shcharansky, Yuri Orlov, Andrei Sakharov, Mykola Rudenko and Viktorus Petkus, as well as lesser-known victims of Soviet and East European repression. (See Addendum A, Opening Address of U.S. Delegation Chairman Griffin Bell.) Other human rights concerns raised by the U.S. and other Western delegations included the continuing repression of those advocating cultural and linguistic freedoms, the attempted Russification of the Baltic states and Ukraine, the persecution of religious activists, Soviet abuse of psychiatry for political purposes, the denial of emigration rights to Soviet Jews and others, and the harassment of members of unofficial peace groups and labor unions.

While the tactic of directly citing specific examples of human rights violations put the Eastern bloc decidedly on the defensive at Madrid, it did little to alleviate the plight of most of those human rights activists. During the course of the Madrid Meeting, more than 500 people in the Soviet Union alone were imprisoned for their activities on behalf of Helsinki-related goals. Nevertheless, these activists continued to urge that their cases be brought to public attention.

The invasion and continued occupation of Afghanistan by Soviet forces was frequently denounced by Western delegations at Madrid. In November 1980, Commission Chairman Dante B. Fascell, in his capacity as Vice-chairman of the U.S. delegation, delivered a strongly worded condemnation of Soviet actions in Afghanistan. (Addendum B)

The imposition of martial law in Poland, which violated the most basic precepts of the Helsinki Accords, became virtually the sole focus of the meeting during the period from February-March, 1982. U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig and the Foreign Ministers of all the NATO states, in addition to several from the Neutral and Non-aligned countries (NNa), came to Madrid to denounce the imposition of martial law and the clear Soviet complicity in the events in Poland. (Addendum C) In November 1982, Commission Co-chairman Robert Dole, serving as Vice-chairman of the U.S. Delegation, condemned the situation in Poland, catalogued the wide-range of Soviet human rights abuses and called on the Soviet Union to undertake a series of steps to improve their dismal record. (Addendum D)

Ambassador Max M. Kampelman, in his last major plenary address on July 18, 1983, crowned the implementation review by calling attention to the whole panoply of ongoing violations of the Final Act by the Soviet and East European governments. (Addendum E) In that statement he noted that even during this concluding phase of the Madrid Meeting -- a period of negotiation and agreement -- violations continued. It must not be forgotten, he regretted, that "signatures on a document do not necessarily produce compliance with its provisions."

Ambassador Kampelman cited as examples continuing Soviet repression of Helsinki Monitors, religious groups and peace activists. He deplored the continued decline in Soviet Jewish emigration and the rise in officially-condoned anti-Semitic propaganda. This pattern of deeds contrary to promises made, Ambassador Kampelman stressed, was "the continuation of a pattern which has plagued the Helsinki process since 1975 and which continues to plague this meeting to this day."

In conclusion, Kampelman expressed the conviction that the Helsinki Final Act, unless taken seriously, will become historically irrelevant. For this reason he emphasized that the U.S. would continue to address implementation failures in various CSCE forums "in order to help mobilize a wider moral and political insistence upon universal respect for the Final Act by compliance with its provisions. Anything less threatens the integrity of our process and of our relationships under it."

On the whole, the Madrid Meeting produced a more thorough and candid review of implementation than was achieved at Belgrade, with a greater range of NATO and even Neutral and Non-aligned delegations criticizing aspects of Eastern compliance. Allied support for the tough U.S. stance on human rights issues was made considerably easier by the fact that Soviet representatives at Madrid reacted to criticism in a more relaxed and resigned manner than had been the case at Belgrade, where even the slightest criticism had evoked an immediate, polemical and for some, intimidating response.

The Helsinki Final Act is not a legally-binding document and there are no enforcement mechanisms to ensure compliance. Nevertheless, the review of implementation at follow-up meetings like Belgrade and Madrid have proven to be a timely and direct means of exerting political and moral pressure for improved implementation. Particularly at Madrid, the review afforded the opportunity for the vast majority of participating states to communicate to the Soviet Union their deep concerns about violations of the Helsinki Accords and to convey this concern through the media to the rest of the world as well.

New Proposals

In January 1981, the meeting began the consideration of new proposals designed to complement or reinforce already existing commitments in all the areas or "baskets" of the Final Act. In all, over 80 proposals were put forward. Both East and West strongly advocated their respective proposals for a post-Madrid security forum, while the West also emphasized its human rights-related proposals including provisions for experts meetings on human rights and human contacts, proposals dealing with the rights of Helsinki Monitors, expanded commitments in the field of religion and a series of measures aimed at improving the human contacts and information provisions in Basket III of the Final Act.

Despite 22 weeks of negotiations, from January through July, 1981, agreement could not be reached on which proposals to include in the Madrid concluding document. Two key issues were at the heart of the impasse -- human rights and military security. The West insisted that improvements in the military

security area had to be balanced by adequate progress in human rights. The East was reluctant to make any human rights concessions and rejected outright many of the West's proposals. Important differences also arose over the nature of a post-Madrid security forum, originally presented in separate proposals by France on behalf of NATO and by Poland for the Warsaw Pact.

The participants reassembled in October, 1981 to resume efforts to reach an agreement. To aid in this effort, the Neutral and Non-aligned countries offered, in December 1981, the first of two formal compromise draft concluding documents. Unfortunately, the imposition of martial law in Poland on December 13, 1981 shocked the meeting and destroyed all hope that any compromise could bring the Madrid Meeting to a successful conclusion by its scheduled recess date of December 18.

When the meeting resumed again in February 1982, the West used it as an occasion to condemn the martial law crackdown in Poland and steadfastly refused to be drawn into what it considered, under the circumstances, sterile and futile discussions on a concluding document. Such was the effect of the Polish crisis that the participating states agreed to suspend further discussions until November, 1982, by which time it was hoped there might be sufficient improvements in the situation to justify the resumption of negotiations.

Towards a Concluding Document

Despite continuing repression in Poland, deliberations resumed on the concluding document in the fall of 1982. At this time the NATO allies introduced a number of amendments to the draft concluding document which took into account the Polish situation, the continuing occupation of Afghanistan and the dismal Eastern human rights record. While formally agreeing to negotiate on them, the East rejected many of these amendments out of hand, while offering minimal concessions on the others.

In March 1983 the Neutral and Non-aligned countries launched their second effort at a compromise draft which omitted important Western proposals and which the Western countries found especially lacking in the human rights dimension. While providing for an experts meeting on human rights and some improvements in the area of family reunification, it contained neither an experts meeting on human contacts nor adequate references to certain other human rights provisions which the West insisted would have to be part of a balanced and substantive concluding document.

Finally, on June 17 the Spanish Prime Minister, acting in his capacity as leader of the host country, launched a further compromise initiative which cut the remaining issues down the middle but which met the key U.S. demand for an experts meeting on human contacts. On this basis agreement was reached on July 15 by all the participating states, except Malta, on a 38-page concluding document. The agreement came as a result of a surprise decision from Moscow, reversing the previous Soviet position of adamant opposition to an experts meeting on human contacts.

The only remaining obstacle still in the way of formal adoption of the Madrid concluding document was the obstinate refusal of Malta to add its agreement unless its demand for a special meeting on Mediterranean security was accepted. Such a meeting was strongly opposed by a majority of participating states, which feared that it would become dominated by Middle East issues outside the purview of CSCE. Nevertheless, Malta stubbornly insisted on its proposal until September 6 when it abruptly accepted a Swedish compromise proposal dropping the security meeting idea entirely but giving Malta the possibility of launching initiatives - to which the other CSCE states would have to agree before being implemented. The Maltese change of heart was believed to have stemmed primarily from a decision by the other 34 states to go ahead without Malta in holding a meeting of their Foreign Ministers and in implementing the concluding document provisionally agreed on July 15.

The final three days of the Madrid Meeting -- September 7, 8 and 9 -- were devoted to closing speeches delivered in all but a few cases by Foreign Ministers of the thirty-five countries. The character of the meeting during these last few days was abruptly transformed into an atmosphere of sharp confrontation following the destruction of a Korean commercial airliner by Soviet military aircraft. The resultant loss of 269 innocent lives, including a U.S. Congressman and other U.S. citizens, sent shock waves around the world and cast a heavy pall over the Madrid Meeting.

The speeches by U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz (Addendum F) and other Western Foreign Ministers, both NATO and Neutral and Non-aligned, were replete with sharp condemnations of this brutal action. The response of Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko, who not only defended the action but threatened future "intruders" with the same fate, only served to increase the tension and the exchange of recriminations. The long-heralded bilateral meeting at Madrid between Shultz and Gromyko, which had been widely viewed as an occasion to reduce hostility and to move forward in the area of arms control concentrated, at U.S. insistence, on the airliner incident and other Soviet human rights violations.

The overall result was that the meeting ended much as it had begun, on a note of uncertainty and ill-will. Even the lengthy concluding document full of promises for improved East-West relations was largely eclipsed by the renewed confrontation.

The Madrid Concluding Document

The concluding document which finally emerged from the Madrid Meeting constitutes a modest advance over the Helsinki Final Act. The new or strengthened provisions are focused largely on those areas of the Final Act -- human rights and human contacts -- where experience has shown that the greatest problems exist. Whether the reinforced language of the Madrid agreement will produce any improved performance in these areas is open to question. However, if the Soviet Union and its allies choose to ignore the new human rights and other commitments which they have undertaken at Madrid, the cynical nature of these repressive regimes will be all the more clear to the world at large. This prospect alone may produce some improvements in Soviet compliance with both the Helsinki and Madrid agreements.

New provisions contained in the Madrid document include oblique references to Helsinki Monitors and direct reference to the right freely to join trade unions, to enhanced religious liberty, to measures against terrorism, to better working conditions for journalists and to improved procedures for family reunification. Provision is also made for six specialized or "expert" meetings on a variety of subjects, including one on human rights in Ottawa in 1985, another on human contacts in Bern in 1986 and a "Cultural Forum" in Budapest in 1985. A successor to the Belgrade and Madrid review conferences will be held in Vienna beginning in November 1986, thereby providing for continuation of the CSCE process. In addition, a commemorative meeting will be held in Helsinki in 1985 marking the tenth anniversary of the signing of the Final Act. These meetings will provide an additional spur for the Soviet and East European governments to improve their performance, particularly in the human rights area.

In the security field, the Madrid concluding document provides for a multi-stage Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe to commence on January 17, 1984 in Stockholm following a 3-week preparatory session in Helsinki in October, 1983. This will be a major new security forum devoted to the discussion and negotiation of early warning measures designed to diminish the threat of surprise military attack. Based primarily on a French proposal and strongly supported by our NATO allies, the conference has been purposely structured to minimize opportunities for the Soviets to turn it into an amorphous

"disarmament forum" for propaganda speeches. The conference during its initial stage is intended by the West to concentrate solely on developing concrete confidence and security-building measures (CSBMs) which expand upon the confidence-building measures (CBMs) already in the Final Act such as the advance notification of military maneuvers. These CSBMs will be applicable to all of Europe, including the entire European part of Soviet territory up to the Ural Mountains. This extension of area is a significant new step because the CBMs contained in the 1975 Helsinki Final Act exempted the Soviet Union from coverage except for 250 kilometers of its territory extending from its European borders.

For most of the Madrid Meeting, the Soviet Union and its allies, unlike the Western and NNa delegations, refused to commit themselves to the continuation of the CSCE process by agreeing to the date and place of the next follow-up review conference. Instead, they hinged their agreement upon what they deemed the "successful" outcome of Madrid, meaning that the meeting had to be crowned with the establishment of a large-scale security meeting. In reality this was an attempt to intimidate the other participants into believing that the Helsinki process would end if the Madrid Meeting did not conclude to Soviet satisfaction. In the final analysis the Soviets dropped their preconditions and agreed to another follow-up review conference in Vienna, approximately three years after the conclusion of Madrid, a reasonable interval for ensuring the viability of the review process.

(A more detailed analysis of the major new proposals adopted at Madrid is contained in a separate section at the end of this report.)

The Madrid Meeting in Perspective

When the Madrid Meeting began in November 1980, no one could have reasonably predicted that it would last for nearly three years. Certainly, the strained international atmosphere during the meeting -- the result of continued Soviet human rights violations, the occupation of Afghanistan and the imposition of martial law in Poland -- did not provide a propitious climate for a speedy and successful conclusion.

Yet, these circumstances alone do not account for the protraction of the Madrid Meeting. Another basic reason for the length of the negotiations is that certain conference participants, notably the NNa countries and most of the NATO allies, were extremely desirous to end Madrid with a substantive and balanced concluding document in contrast to the outcome of the first CSCE review meeting in Belgrade -- a terse communique containing no new measures. A repeat of Belgrade at Madrid, they feared, would significantly diminish the stature and viability of the CSCE process.

In addition, many West European and NNa governments, under growing domestic pro-disarmament pressure, were anxious that the Madrid Meeting provide an impetus for improvements in East-West relations as well as for the invigoration of arms control negotiations. The focus of this latter desire was a strong push for a Madrid-mandated Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. Particularly the United States, but other Western states as well, insisted that such a security conference be balanced by comparable developments in the human rights dimension of the Helsinki process. The difficult negotiations leading to the achievement of such a balance also account in great measure for the length of the Madrid Meeting.

On the whole, the results of tne Madrid Meeting are mixed. On the plus side, the ending of the meeting with a balanced and substantive concluding agreement containing provisions for a security conference and the experts meetings on human rights and human contacts met with evident satisfaction among the Western allies and the Neutral and Non-aligned countries. At the same time, Madrid failed to produce any credible sign that the Soviet Union intends to regard its new commitments as an obligation to cease or diminish the pattern of internal repression and external brutality which characterized Soviet behavior thoughout the entire meeting. In fact, such behavior, ranging from curtailed emigration to increased political oppression, is striking evidence that Soviet implementation of its Helsinki promises is at or near its lowest point since the signing of the Final Act in 1975.

Furthermore, there is no convincing evidence as yet that the Soviets intend to make the gestures of good will, including the release of political prisoners, which the U.S. informally demanded as a condition for ending the Madrid Meeting. If such gestures are eventually forthcoming, even though they may be merely one time concessions and hold no promise of changing basic Soviet behavior patterns, the Madrid Meeting will at least have established some minimal correlation between words and deeds in the CSCE process. On the other hand, the absence of even these minimal signs of good faith will be another clear indication that the Soviet Union does not have the slightest intention of honoring the human rights commitments it agreed to at Madrid.

A further question is whether the Korean airliner catastrophe will have a permanent impact on the results of the Madrid Meeting by, in effect, cancelling out the modest gains achieved in the concluding document. Whatever its long term effect, it seems certain that it will rank alongside the invasion of Afghanistan, the brutal imposition of martial law in Poland and the unrelenting repression of human rights in the Soviet Union as a major shock to the CSCE process.

Nevertheless, the fact that the CSCE process can continue to sustain such setbacks and still survive would appear to indicate that the participating States themselves still view it as a viable mechanism for the consideration of East-West problems.

It can be said, in fact, that the participating states at Madrid, by mandating a series of specialized CSCE meetings ranging from military security to human rights to culture, have created, in effect, the foundations of a continuing framework for the consideration of a broad spectrum of East-West issues. It is generally acknowledged that the Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament will likely continue for several years. Similarly, the specialized meetings on other issues may well be repeated in one form or another just as the post-Belgrade meetings on Peaceful Settlement of Disputes and Mediterranean Cooperation have now been scheduled to hold additional sessions between the Madrid and Vienna Conferences. Although, in terms of real accomplishment, the record of those meetings held so far is not particularly encouraging, they do serve to keep the door open to further dialogue and the possibility of some concrete progress when the international climate is propitious.

The Madrid Concluding Document: A Look at the Main Provisions

The Madrid concluding document is a thirty-eight page agreement covering nearly every aspect of East-West relations. It is intended to supplement, not replace, the Final Act as a basic guideline for the conduct of these relations. The primacy of the Final Act is demonstrated by the fact that it was signed by the heads of state of the 35 participating nations, while the Madrid Agreement and the Belgrade document before it, were adopted by unanimous consent (without signature) by representatives of the participating states. Like the Helsinki Final Act itself, the Madrid concluding document is not legally binding, but is considered to carry strong moral and political obligations.

The Madrid concluding document following the outline of the Final Act, is divided into six major sections: a Preamble; Basket I, which contains provisions on principles and military security; Basket II, covering economic and scientific cooperation; a section on Mediterranean cooperation; Basket III on humanitarian issues; and a section on follow-up to the Madrid meeting. The document also includes two annexes dealing with the specialized meetings on Mediterranean cooperation and human contacts.

Preamble and Basket I: Principles and Military Security

In areas of importance to the United States and other Western countries, notably human rights, the Preamble and Basket I section of the Madrid concluding document mark a useful, if modest, advance over existing language in the Final Act. On certain important issues -- trade union rights, religious liberty and terrorism -- new texts have been adopted which extend the scope and significance of the CSCE process as an international human rights forum. However, in some places such as the introduction to Basket I, the Soviets were successful in seeing that the provisions concentrated on issues of military security and contained no direct reference to human rights.

Human Rights

Ten of the nineteen provisions in the Principles section of the Madrid concluding document deal with human rights issues. Several paragraphs are devoted to the role and importance of human rights in relations between states. These references, building on language in the Final Act, establish an explicit link between respect for human rights and the improvement of mutual relations. The concluding document stresses the need to "assure constant and tangible progress" in human rights irrespective of political, economic or social systems.

The human rights experts meeting in Ottawa in 1985, in particular, will be an innovation in the CSCE process. At this meeting the participating states will discuss "questions concerning respect, in their states for human rights and fundamental freedoms." The meeting will provide an opportunity to hold the East accountable for their human rights practices and violations in the interval since Madrid, as well as to discuss measures to improve implementation of the Final Act's human rights provisions.

Religious Liberty

In the Madrid concluding document, the participating states reaffirm their respect for religious liberty and, in an important advance over Final Act language, agree "to take the action necessary to ensure" these rights. In addition, Basket III contains a new provision encouraging contacts and meetings between representatives of religious institutions of different countries.

Rights of National Minorities

The Madrid document stresses the importance of "constant progress in ensuring respect for and actual enjoyment of the rights of persons belonging to national minorities as well as protecting their legitimate interests..." This provision clearly supports the aspirations of the diverse ethnic and national groups in the USSR and Eastern Europe.

Helsinki Monitors

The role of Helsinki Monitors in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe was the focus of intense East-West differences during the Madrid deliberations. While the East, not unexpectedly, refused any explicit reference to the monitoring groups in the concluding document, the West was successful in having several texts repeated from the Final Act and in one instance strengthened. The Principles section of the concluding document reiterates "the right of the individual to know and act upon his rights" and, in a new phrase, calls upon all states to "take the actions necessary...to effectively ensure this right." Another paragraph in this section reiterates a key Final Act provision that "governments, institutions, organizations and persons have a relevant and positive role to play" in implementing the Final Act. There is also a provision in the Preamble on the need to "encourage genuine efforts to implement the Final Act," which can be seen as an oblique reference to the role of Helsinki Monitors.

Poland and Trade Unions

A direct reference to the Solidarity trade union is contained in the Madrid concluding document where it calls upon the participating states to ensure, in compliance with local law, "the right of workers freely to establish and join trade unions, the right of trade unions freely to exercise their activities..." This provision is a significant advance over the Final Act since that document contains no reference to trade unions or their activities. The West was unsuccessful, however, in persuading the East to accept an explicit reference to the right to strike in this paragraph.

In addition, in the Preamble indirect reference is made to the contentious debate over Poland which was highlighted in February, 1982 when NATO and Neutral and non-aligned Foreign Ministers, including U.S. Secretary of State Haig came to Madrid to denounce the imposition of martial law. The document reflects this by stating that certain states "at times represented at a higher level" considered it necessary to stress that respect for Final Act principles was essential for the improvement of mutual relations. A more direct reference to the Polish developments was denied consensus by the Eastern countries.

Afghanistan

Soviet intransigence precluded explicit reference to the continued occupation of Afghanistan. The concluding document does, however, obliquely refer to this issue by stressing the need to "seek solutions to outstanding problems through peaceful means" and by reaffirming the principle that all states should refrain from the threat or use of force.

Terrorism

Several paragraphs of the Madrid document are devoted to the need to combat terrorism, a subject not dealt with in any detail in the Final Act. The document includes a strong Western-sponsored statement that all signatories will take effective measures to prevent and suppress acts of terrorism and will prevent their territories from being used as the base for terrorist activities against any other participating state. In addition, the document contains a pledge to refrain from direct or indirect assistance, financing or toleration of terrorist or subversive activities aimed at the violent overthrow of governments.

Military Security

The concluding document provides for a multi-stage Conference on Confidence and Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, based on a French proposal for expanding military confidence-building measures (CBMs) already in the Final Act and extending their scope to the entire European part of Soviet territory. CBMs are early warning provisions such as advance notification of military movements and maneuvers designed to reduce the threat of surprise attack.

This conference, strongly supported by our NATO allies, has been structured to minimize opportunities for the Soviets to turn it into an amorphous "disarmament forum" for propaganda speeches. The West intends that the conference, during its initial stage, will deal exclusively with proposals for specific CBMs to be called Confidence and Security-building Measures (CSBMs). However, there is no guarantee in the conference mandate against the Soviets raising broad propaganda issues. CSBMs to be agreed at the conference are to be militarily significant, verifiable, politically binding and applicable to the whole of Europe from the Atlantic Ocean to the Ural Mountains. This extension of area to the entire European part of Soviet territory is a significant new step because the confidence-building measures in the 1975 Helsinki Final Act exempted Soviet territory from coverage except for 250 kilometers extending from its European borders.

Initially at Madrid, the Soviets had adamantly refused even to consider such a drastic expansion in the coverage of their territory. In February 1981, President Brezhnev, in a dramatic turn around, signaled Soviet willingness to accept this expansion provided that the geographic area of coverage be extended, in a commensurate way, into the Atlantic as compensation for its extension to the Ural Mountains. The Soviet objective, clearly, was to undermine the international principle recognizing free use of the high seas and thereby to create the possibility for interference with the movement of U.S. forces to areas of the world outside of Europe. This issue of the area of applicability of new CSBMs remained one of the key points of disagreement for most of the meeting.

In the final analysis, the extension to the Urals was balanced by agreement to a diluted formulation, that only the "adjoining sea area and air space" around the European continent will be included in the geographic area covered by the new CSBMs. However, the new CSBMs will only be applicable to those naval and air activities in these areas which are linked to land-based military activities taking place on the European continent.

The Stockholm meeting will be an integral part of the CSCE process and will report to the Vienna follow-up meeting in 1986 on the results of its work. At Vienna a decision will be made whether to move on to the next stage of the conference envisaged as dealing with disarmament issues.

Basket II: Cooperation in the Field of Economics, of Science and Technology and of the Environment

Consensus on the Madrid document's provisions on Basket II was reached quickly compared to the other areas of negotiation, all of the substantive issues having been resolved by the end of July 1981. In all, seventeen provisions were finally adopted many of which state, in more specific terms than the Final Act, the prerequisites for economic cooperation in Europe.

A significant element of the Basket II section of the Madrid document is the acknowledgement of the problems created by the use of compensation transactions (counter-trade) in East-West trade. Compensation trade, not specifically mentioned in the Final Act, is the increasingly used practice which makes Western exporters' sales to East Europe and the Soviet Union contingent upon the purchase of Eastern goods by the Western exporter. This system has proven to be a major obstacle to the expansion of East-West trade and business contacts.

On the positive side, progress was made by the adoption of provisions calling for the expansion of economic information and for the improvement of business contacts and facilities. These provisions focus on the need for specific improvements in the quality and quantity of published business and economic statistics. The Madrid document also highlights the need to improve conditions for contract negotiations, to increase contacts between sellers and end-users and to improve the general conditions under which foreign businesses must operate. Recognizing the importance of science and technology in economic and social development, the concluding document calls for direct, personal contact among scientists and specialists. The document also favorably notes cooperation in the field of the environment, especially the efforts which led to the adoption in November 1979 of the Resolution on Long Range and Transboundary Air Pollution by the U.N. Economic Commission for Europe (ECE).

The Madrid concluding document does not call for any specific meetings related to Basket II issues between the conclusion of the Madrid meeting and the convening of the Vienna Meeting in 1986, but does recommend a symposium on management training. During this interval the primary forum for further multilateral discussion of Basket II issues will

continue to be the U.N. Economic Commission for Europe located in Geneva. The past contributions of this body were acknowledged at Madrid and the concluding document calls for further efforts by the ECE to encourage implementation of the Basket II provisions.

Questions Relating to Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean

Apart from Malta and, to a lesser degree, certain other Mediterranean CSCE states, the majority of the participating states at Madrid sought to limit the number of new Mediterranean initiatives to a minimum. It was widely felt that such initiatives were designed to benefit only some rather than all of the CSCE countries and, consequently, tended to distort the intention of the Final Act. The initiatives which were finally accepted were largely the result of Maltese insistence and of fears of Maltese readiness to sabotage the meeting by denying consensus to the concluding document.

The Maltese proposal which gained the most attention was a demand at the end of the Madrid meeting for a conference on Mediterranean security. Maltese inflexibility on this issue, despite overwhelming opposition from the other CSCE states, effectively stalled the meeting for nearly two months and threatened to disrupt the entire CSCE process. Only a last minute decision by the other 34 participating states, achieved with great difficulty, to proceed to implement the provisionally-agreed Madrid document without Maltese approval eventually forced the Maltese hand and succeeded in having the proposal dropped. In its place the meeting agreed to a carefully-hedged Swedish compromise proposal promising to support, "where appropriate", initiatives which Malta and other CSCE states might put forward concerning Mediterranean security.

In other areas, Malta succeeded in having the Madrid meeting endorse Malta's new status of neutrality and agree to study the possibility of ad hoc meetings on Mediterranean questions. The Madrid document also provides for a 10 day seminar in Venice on Mediterranean cooperation in the fields of culture, science and education to continue the work of the six week experts meeting held in Malta after the Belgrade review conference. The seminar idea was proposed by Italy with strong support from Malta.

Basket III: Cooperation in the Humanitarian Field

Human Contacts

Throughout the Madrid meeting the West attempted to move forward the Helsinki commitments in Basket III - particularly in the human contacts and information sections - while the East sought to qualify and limit those commitments. Most of the original Western proposals for inclusion in the human contacts section are incorporated, albeit often in diluted form, in the concluding document. Limited improvements over the Final Act have been made in several areas where the participating states have pledged:

-- to "favorably deal with" and "decide upon" applications for family meetings, family reunification and binational marriages. The Final Act provides only that they will "consider" or "deal with applications in a positive and humanitarian spirit."

-- to decide marriage and family reunification applications "within six months." This reference to a definite time period is a useful improvement over the Final Act commitment merely to decide "as expeditiously as possible."

-- to refrain from actions modifying rights to "employment, housing, residence status, family support, access to social, economic or educational benefits" for those making or renewing application for family reunification. This directly addresses abusive procedures often applied to visa applicants in the USSR and Eastern Europe.

-- to provide the necessary forms and information on emigration procedures and regulations which, up to now, often have been unavailable.

-- to reduce fees charged in connection with emigration "to bring them to a moderate level in relation to the average monthly income." The reference to monthly income provides a new standard by which to judge fee levels which in some cases have been exorbitant.

-- to inform applicants as "expeditiously as possible of the decision" on their cases and, in cases of refusal, to inform them of "their right to renew applications after reasonably short intervals". Both the fact that applicants must be informed of decisions and the recognition of the right to reapply are important in that many applicants in the USSR have been given "final refusals" and told they could not reapply.

The Madrid concluding document also adds an important new element to the provisions of the Final Act by specifying that visitors to diplomatic and other official missions and consular posts will be assured access to them. This provision is designed to ensure that everyone, including citizens of the USSR and the countries of Eastern Europe, can visit foreign embassies without interference.

The last important, substantive issue to be resolved at Madrid was the provision for a 6-week experts meeting on human contacts to be held in Bern, Switzerland in April, 1986. The U.S. had pushed for this meeting since the beginning of the Madrid conference. The Soviets refused even to consider such a proposal until near the very end of the Madrid meeting when, with great reluctance, they agreed to the experts meeting with the proviso that reference to it be made in a supplementary annex called a "Chairman's Statement" rather than in the main text of the Madrid document. This statement, however, has equal status with the rest of the document and has been officially published as an integral part of it.

In itself, the human contacts experts meeting will not provide any guarantee of Soviet compliance with the human contacts section of the Final Act and the Madrid document. It will, however, provide an excellent and timely mechanism for examining how the six new human contacts provisions outlined above have been implemented and will be a useful forum to encourage greater compliance with all the Final Act's human contacts provisions.

Information, Cultural and Educational Exchange

The Madrid concluding document contains several provisions aimed at improving working conditions for journalists and expanding the dissemination of printed material. In some cases these provisions reiterate Final Act texts while in others they expand on them. Among the more noteworthy inclusions are:

-- a provision that participating states will encourage the public sale and distribution of printed matter from other states, including making them "accessible in reading rooms."

-- a provision that prices of foreign publications should not be excessive in relation to prices in their country of origin. This language is somewhat qualified because Western governments themselves find it difficult to make commitments in an area which is largely the preserve of private publishers.

-- language confirming that states will "further extend the possibilities" for the public to take out foreign subscriptions. In asserting that anyone can subscribe to foreign publications, the Madrid document improves on the Final Act which only speaks about developing "possibilities for taking out subscriptions according to modalities..."

-- a commitment to grant permanent correspondents and their families multiple entry and exit visas valid for a year.

-- a new provision endorsing "direct contacts among journalists."

-- a pledge to decide visa applications from journalists without "undue delay" and to reexamine within a reasonable time applications which have been refused.

-- a sentence stating that journalists traveling for personal reasons will receive the same treatment as other visitors. This is a new element, not found in the Final Act, and is in response to complaints from Western journalists.

-- a pledge to "examine the possibility" of co-accrediting journalists already permanently accredited to other countries. This is a useful provision for most Western news organizations which have only one or two journalists covering all of Eastern Europe.

-- a commitment to take "concrete measures" to provide more extensive travel opportunities for journalists and to "inform journalists in advance" of areas closed for security reasons.

-- a new sentence pledging states to "increase the possibilities" and "improve the conditions" for foreign journalists to "establish and maintain personal contacts and communications with their sources."

-- a provision that radio and television journalists may be accompanied by their own sound and film technicians and use their own equipment so that they do not have to rely on the technicians and equipment of the host country.

-- a commitment that journalists may carry with them reference material, including personal notes and files, to be used for their professional purposes.

-- a provision on the establishment of press centers open to national and foreign journalists. This may be helpful considering the paucity of such facilities in the USSR and other Eastern countries.

-- a pledge to encourage institutions to make available lists of open archival material. This should help remedy one of the problems faced by exchange scholars, students and teachers.

The concluding document also contains a provision for a "Cultural Forum" to take place in Budapest in October 1985. Based on the model of the Scientific Forum held in Hamburg in 1980, the Cultural Forum will be attended by leading cultural figures as well as officials of the participating states. The participants will discuss problems relating to the expansion of contacts and exchanges in various fields of culture. The Cultural Forum will provide a useful and timely opportunity for the West to conduct a review of how artists, writers and other cultural figures in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe are treated within their own countries.

Not covered in the Madrid document are two important issues on which it proved impossible to reach consensus: a provision barring the jamming of foreign radio broadcasts and a text providing that foreign journalists should not be expelled for the content of articles they or their newspapers have published.

Follow-Up: The Vienna Meeting

The Madrid concluding document provides for the continuation of the CSCE review process by scheduling another review conference in Vienna beginning on November 4, 1986, about three years after the completion of the Madrid Meeting. It will be preceded by a two week preparatory meeting commencing on September 23, 1986. To avoid the protracted procedural debate which marked the nine week Madrid preparatory session, this next preparatory meeting will merely have to make minor adjustments to the agenda, working programme and other modalities used during the Madrid meeting.

In addition, a series of six specialized meetings mentioned previously in this analysis will be held between the Madrid and Vienna review conferences:

1. The first stage of the Conference on Confidence and Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, commencing January 17, 1984 in Stockholm, to be preceded by a three week preparatory meeting beginning on October 25, 1983 in Helsinki;

2. A six week Experts' Meeting on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes, in Athens, beginning March 21, 1984;

3. A seminar on Mediterranean cooperation, in Venice, from October 16-26, 1984;

4. An Experts' Meeting on Human Rights in Ottawa, lasting six weeks and commencing on May 7, 1985;

5. A Cultural Forum, in Budapest, commencing on October 15, 1985, to be prepared by a two week meeting of experts in Budapest beginning November 21, 1984;

6. An Experts' Meeting on Human Contacts, in Bern, Switzerland, lasting six weeks and commencing April 16, 1986;

Finally, a commemorative meeting will be held in Helsinki, in 1985, marking the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act.

NAMES MENTIONED BY THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION
TO THE MADRID MEETING OF THE CSCE

The following list of the 119 human rights activists named by the U.S. delegation during the course of the Madrid meeting constitutes an illustrative cross-section of the thousands of courageous individuals in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe who have suffered official repression merely for exercising their rights under the Helsinki Final Act. Of the 119 names mentioned, 103 involve the Soviet Union, 9 Czechoslovakia and 7 Poland. A small number of these persons have been released from custody or been permitted to emigrate. The remainder are still subject to persecution. The wide range of human rights violations of the Helsinki accords resulting from the repression of these named individuals includes the following:

-- the harassment and imprisonment of Helsinki Monitors and other human rights activists in the Ukrainian, Moscow, Lithuanian, Georgian and Armenian groups in the USSR, Charter '77 and VONS in Czechoslovakia and KSS "KOR" in Poland.

-- the persecution of religious groups and activists throughout Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

-- the suppression of independent peace groups.

-- the violation of national minority rights.

-- the denial of trade union rights and the arrest of unofficial labor leaders in Poland and the USSR.

-- the persecution of scientists such as Andrei Sakharov.

Other continuing violations of the Helsinki agreement include the denial of the right to emigrate, the obstruction of the free flow of information and interference with the delivery of international mail.

Aksyonov, Vasily -- Soviet writer stripped of citizenship.

Alekseyeva, Yelizaveta -- Andrei Sakharov's daughter-in-law.

Antonov, Ivan -- Imprisoned Baptist minister.

Antonov, Pavel -- Imprisoned Baptist activist.

Badzio, Yuri -- Imprisoned Ukrainian activist.

Bakhmin, Vyacheslav -- Imprisoned member, Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes.

Balovlenkov, Yuri -- Soviet spouse of American citizen.

Batovrin, Sergei -- Formerly imprisoned member of independent Soviet peace group.

Battek, Rudolf (CSSR) -- Imprisoned Charter '77 spokesman.

Benda, Vaclav (CSSR) -- Charter '77 activist.

Bolonkin, Alexander -- Formerly imprisoned Russian mathematician.

Bonner, Elena -- Founding member of the Moscow Helsinki Monitors and wife of Andrei Sakharov.

Brailovsky, Viktor -- Imprisoned Jewish refusenik.

Bumeisters, Juris -- Imprisoned Latvian activist.

Cerny, Albert (CSSR) -- Charter '77 activist.

Chekhanavicius, Arvydas -- Lithuanian activist, forcibly confined in psychiatric hospital.

Chmykhalov Family -- Soviet Pentecostals recently allowed to emigrate.

Chornovil, Vyacheslav -- Imprisoned Ukrainian Helsinki Monitor.

Dienstbier, Jiri (CSSR) -- Charter '77 activist.

Drumova, Maria -- Soviet Baptist.

Dzhemilev, Mustafa -- Crimean Tatar activist.

Elbert, Lev -- Imprisoned Jewish refusenik.

Finkelstein, Eitan -- Lithuanian Helsinki Monitor and Jewish refusenik.

Fradkin, Daniel -- Jewish refusenik.

Gajauskas, Balys -- Imprisoned Lithuanian Helsinki Monitor.

Geremek, Bronislaw (Poland) -- Solidarity activist arrested under martial law; released 7/83.

Geremek, Martin (Poland) -- Arrested son of Bronislaw; student; released.

Gimpelson, Grigory -- Jewish refusenik.

Gluzman, Semyon -- Formerly imprisoned Soviet psychiatrist.

Grivnina, Irina -- Formerly imprisoned member, Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes.

Gruntorad, Jiri (CSSR) -- Imprisoned Charter '77 and VONS activist.

Guberman, Igor -- Jewish activist.

Hajek, Jiri (CSSR) -- Charter '77 activist.

Havel, Vaclav (CSSR) -- Charter '77 activist.

Imnadze, Avtandil -- Imprisoned Georgian activist.

Jurevicius, Mecislovas -- Imprisoned Lithuanian Helsinki Monitor.

Kalistratova, Sofya -- Moscow Helsinki Monitor.

Kalven, Larissa -- Soviet spouse of American citizen.

Kandyba, Ivan -- Imprisoned Ukrainian Helsinki Monitor.

Kaps, Uldis -- Family reunification case.

Khailo, Vladimir Pavlovich -- Baptist activist forcibly confined in psychiatric hospital.

Klebanov, Vladimir -- Founder of free trade union, forcibly confined in psychiatric hospital.

Kochubievsky, Feliks -- Imprisoned Jewish refusenik.

Kopelev, Lev -- Soviet writer.

Koryagin, Anatoly -- Imprisoned psychiatrist and member, Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes.

Kovalev, Ivan -- Imprisoned Moscow Helsinki Monitor.

Kovalev, Sergei -- Imprisoned Russian human rights activist.

Krasivsky, Dr. Zinovy -- Imprisoned Ukrainian activist.

Krupinski, Miroslaw (Poland) -- Imprisoned Deputy Chairman of Solidarity.

Kubasiewicz, Ewa (Poland) -- Formerly imprisoned Solidarity activist.

Kukk, Juri -- Deceased Estonian activist.

Kukobaka, Mikhail -- Imprisoned Belorussian activist.

Landa, Malva -- Imprisoned Moscow Helsinki Monitor.

Lapienis, Vladas -- Imprisoned Lithuanian Catholic activist.

Lerner, Aleksandr -- Jewish refusenik.

Lozansky, Tatyana -- Soviet spouse of American citizen.

Lukyanenko, Lev -- Imprisoned Ukrainian Helsinki Monitor.

Lytvyn, Yuri -- Imprisoned Ukrainian Helsinki Monitor.

Makeeva, Valeriya -- Russian Orthodox nun, formerly confined in psychiatric hospital.

Marchenko, Anatoly -- Imprisoned Soviet writer.

Marynovych, Myroslav -- Imprisoned Ukrainian Helsinki Monitor.

Meiman, Naum -- Moscow Helsinki Monitor and Jewish refusenik.

Mendelevich, Iosif -- Formerly imprisoned Jewish refusenik.

Meshko, Oksana -- Internally exiled Ukrainian Helsinki Monitor.

Michaelson, Galina Golsman -- Soviet spouse of American citizen.

Mrouca, Josef (CSSR) -- Formerly imprisoned Slovak priest.

Nashpitz, Mark -- Formerly imprisoned Jewish refusenik.

Nazarian, Robert -- Imprisoned Armenian Helsinki Monitor.

Nekipelov, Viktor -- Imprisoned Moscow Helsinki Monitor.

Nikitin, Aleksei -- Activist for workers' rights, forcibly committed to psychiatric hospital.

Niklus, Mart -- Imprisoned Estonian activist.

Nudel, Ida -- Formerly internally exiled Jewish refusenik.

Onyszkiewicz, Janusz (Poland) -- Arrested former Solidarity spokesman; released 7/83.

Orlov, Yuri -- Imprisoned founder of Moscow Helsinki Monitors.

Osipova, Tatiana -- Imprisoned Moscow Helsinki Monitor.

Ovsishcher, Lev -- Jewish refusenik.

Paritsky, Aleksandr -- Imprisoned Jewish refusenik.

Petkus, Viktoras -- Imprisoned Lithuanian Helsinki Monitor.

Petrov, Sergei -- Soviet spouse of American citizen.

Plakhotnyuk, Dr. Mykola -- Imprisoned Ukrainian activist.

Plumpa, Petras -- Formerly imprisoned Lithuanian Catholic activist.

Podrabinek, Aleksandr -- Imprisoned member, Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes.

Prestin, Vladimir -- Jewish refusenik.

Radzinsky, Oleg -- Imprisoned member of independent Soviet peace group.

Ratushinskaya, Irina -- Imprisoned Soviet poet of Polish descent.

Romanyuk, Vasyl -- Formerly imprisoned Ukrainian Orthodox priest.

Rudenko, Mykola -- Imprisoned founder of Ukrainian Helsinki Monitors.

Rudenko, Raisa -- Imprisoned wife of Ukrainian Helsinki Monitors' founder, Mykola Rudenko.

Rumachik, Pyotr -- Internally exiled Baptist activist.

Sakharov, Andrei -- Nobel laureate, human rights activist, physicist, in internal exile since January 1980.

Sasnauskas, Julius -- Internally exiled Lithuanian activist.

Senderov, Valery -- Imprisoned member of independent labor union.

Serebrov, Feliks -- Imprisoned Moscow Helsinki Monitor and founder, Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes.

Shcharansky, Anatoly -- Imprisoned member, Moscow Helsinki Monitors, Jewish activist and refusenik.

Shatravka, Alexander -- Imprisoned Soviet peace activist.

Shukhevych, Yuri -- Imprisoned Ukrainian Helsinki Monitor.

Sichko, Petro -- Imprisoned Ukrainian Helsinki Monitor.

Sichko, Vasyl -- Imprisoned Ukrainian Helsinki Monitor.

Skuodis, Vytautas -- Imprisoned Lithuanian Helsinki Monitor and U.S citizen.

Slepak, Vladimir -- Formerly internally exiled Moscow Helsinki Monitor and Jewish refusenik.

Statkevicius, Dr. Algirdas -- Lithuanian Helsinki Monitor forcibly confined in psychiatric hospital.

Stolyar, Abe -- Jewish refusenik and U.S. citizen.

Sysoyev, Konstantin -- Formerly imprisoned Baptist activist.

Terelya, Iosif -- Imprisoned Ukrainian Catholic activist.

Terleckas, Antanas -- Imprisoned Lithuanian activist.

Ternovsky, Leonard -- Imprisoned Moscow Helsinki Monitor and member, Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes.

Trycinski, Wladislaw Jerzy (Poland) -- Worker sentenced to 9 years imprisonment.

Tykhy, Oleksy -- Imprisoned Ukrainian Helsinki Monitor.

Uhl, Peter (CSSR) -- Imprisoned Charter '77 activist.

Vaiciunas, Vytautas -- Imprisoned Lithuanian Helsinki Monitor.

Valov, Yuri -- Member of Initiative Group to Defend the Rights of Invalids, forcibly confined in psychiatric hospital.

Vashchenko Family -- Soviet Pentecostals recently allowed to emigrate.

Velikanova, Tatiana -- Imprisoned Russian human rights activist.

Voronova, Anna -- Soviet spouse of American citizen.

Walesa, Lech (Poland) -- Elected leader of outlawed Polish trade union, Solidarity; Nobel laureate.

Wallenberg, Raoul -- Missing Swedish diplomat presumed alive and imprisoned in USSR.

Yakunin, Gleb -- Imprisoned Russian Orthodox priest and founder of the Christian Committee to Defend the Rights of Believers.

Yanson, Francesca -- Family reunification case.

Zissels, Iosif -- Formerly imprisoned Ukrainian Helsinki Monitor.

Zotov, Mikhail -- Workers' rights activist, forcibly confined in psychiatric hospital.

OPENING ADDRESS BY
THE HONORABLE GRIFFIN B. BELL
CHAIRMAN, U.S. DELEGATION
CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

November 13, 1980

It is appropriate that this second review meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe should be held in democratic Spain. From the days of Queen Isabella, Spain has played a major role in Europe, and the explorations of Columbus -- sailing under the Spanish Crown -- established the link between the Old World and the New, a link recognized at our conference. It is also appropriate that the Spanish delegation should be headed by Javier Ruperez, my distinguished colleague, for we well remember the active and constructive role he played in the negotiation of the Helsinki Final Act. In expressing my own delegation's view of that historic document, I can do no better than to quote the words of His Majesty Juan Carlos, the King of Spain. He said: "The main themes of international comity are reflected in the basic document of this conference, the Helsinki Act of 1975, with regard to security as well as to cooperation, to humanitarian acts, to the right of free communication, and to the overall maintenance of individual and social rights."

The United States is fully committed to the process which began with the signing of the Final Act by the heads of state of our thirty-five nations. We are committed to that process because we believe it represents the soundest basis on which we can develop and strengthen our mutual relations. We support that process as well because it is founded on principles whose validity and truth have been tested and confirmed in our own experience, throughout our own history as an independent nation. Let me cite a few examples:

- The Final Act demands respect for the sovereign equality of all nations. This principle was a touchstone of our early history as a nation, for we had to fight to establish and then to maintain our sovereignty and national identity.

- The Final Act proclaims the principle of self-determination of peoples, a principle which is basic to our American Revolution. Indeed, it was fitting that a visionary American president, Woodrow Wilson, should have championed that principle following World War I and that his efforts should have aided the emergence of several of the nations represented at this conference. And it is fitting that today my country should be in the forefront of those calling for self-determination where it is ignored or denied.

- Lastly, the Final Act embodies at its core the great principle of human rights and fundamental freedoms, a principle born during the European Enlightenment, nurtured by such great thinkers as Locke and Voltaire, and given voice by Thomas Jefferson in these words from our Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Let no one doubt, therefore, the fidelity of the United States to the commitments we undertook at Helsinki. We could no more turn our back on those commitments than we could turn our back on our own heritage as a nation.

CSCE is more than a document. It is a dynamic and positive process; a process which is slowly but surely breaking down the barriers which grew up at the height of the Cold War; a process which is bringing people together across the East-West divide; a process which facilitates the exchange of ideas and information and the growth of economic contacts; and a process which calls on each of us to carry out the obligations we assumed at Helsinki and which calls on all of us to examine how well those obligations are being carried out.

This Madrid meeting is the second major gathering since that historic day in Helsinki. Let me say a word about the first. The Belgrade meeting made clear that CSCE was a continuing process because it confirmed that the nations which signed the Final Act could come together periodically to examine how their commitments to one another had been honored and implemented. Such periodic examinations of the record are necessary. Without them, the great undertaking of Helsinki might remain a static, not a dynamic, concept. It was therefore encouraging for my government that, although the discussions at Belgrade were sometimes difficult and always frank, the Belgrade gathering provided -- by consensus -- for the holding of a similar meeting at Madrid as the next major step in the Helsinki process. We can hope that this process will continue as all nations come to recognize the truth that strong and confident governments have nothing to fear from plain speaking, from whatever source it might come.

Because of our conviction that CSCE is a positive process, indispensable to the advancement of security and cooperation in Europe, my government will be second to none in working to ensure that this Madrid meeting further strengthens the CSCE process. We are not here to confront and to polemicize. We are here to cooperate and to construct.

Mr. Chairman, those gathered around this table will hear often over the next several weeks that the words of the Final Act on human rights and human contacts must be interpreted in different ways when applied in different social systems. This argument is untrue - and profoundly harmful to the spirit of our enterprise. The men and women who are citizens of our countries do not possess human rights because they are members of this or that social system. They possess human rights because they are human beings. Those rights derive, in the words of the Final Act, from the "inherent dignity of the human person and are essential for his free and full development."

To put it another way, I would like to cite a story involving the great Russian writer Lev Tolstoy and our American President Abraham Lincoln. Tolstoy was an admirer of Lincoln and he liked to explain Lincoln's greatness to the simple people on his estate. Lincoln, Tolstoy said, was a great man because his every act was rooted in humanity, truth, justice or pity. That description, it seems to me, suggests the principles on which the human rights in the Final Act are based.

The Final Act itself tells us what those rights are. They include the freedom of thought, of conscience and of religion or belief. They include the freedom effectively to exercise civil, political, economic, social, cultural and other rights and freedoms. They include the right not only to practice but also to profess religious belief according to the dictates of one's own conscience. And they are, taken together, an essential factor for peace, for justice and for friendly relations and cooperation among states. Governments can deny them; but they can neither change, nor reduce, nor destroy them.

The principles I have just repeated come from the Final Act, but not only from the Final Act. They are principles which summarize over 2,000 years of our intellectual and political history, from Aristotle's charter for a just state, to Tom Paine's fiery defense of political freedom, to the eloquence of Dag Hammarskjold in the cause of human dignity. Those principles speak from our common heritage. They speak in the voices of patriots revered by each of our nations. They speak to all of us here and to all of the citizens of our countries. The question which history will ask about our endeavor is how well we lived up to those principles; whether we advanced or set back the cause of human rights and of human freedom.

It is a question which, in the first instance, each of us must ask himself or herself. We in the United States have done so, and will continue to do so. I believe the U.S. record of implementation is something we can be proud of. We are a free society - free enough to admit our shortcomings and concerned enough to try to correct them. The degree to which we have

fulfilled our obligations under the Helsinki Final Act is an open book, for all to read. We are willing to profit from examination, suggestions and criticism. And this should come as no surprise, for the very first document of our Republic -- our Declaration of Independence, signed on July 4, 1776 -- states that we owe "a decent respect to the Opinions of Mankind."

Just as the obligations undertaken under the Final Act require each of us to look carefully at our own implementation record, so they require each of us to look carefully at the implementation record of others. The record since our meeting in Belgrade has had some bright spots, especially in the area of freer movement across international frontiers. Let me cite some examples:

- A number of countries -- among them Romania, the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Bulgaria -- have made important efforts to resolve the outstanding cases of their citizens who wish to be reunited with their families elsewhere.

- In several countries -- such as Hungary, the German Democratic Republic and Poland -- there have been efforts to explore how church and state can better live with each other, consistent with the commitment in the Final Act to expand religious freedom.

- In Eastern Europe as a whole in 1979, over 50,000 ethnic Germans were granted permission to join their relatives in the West.

- There has been encouraging progress in some countries toward creating more responsive and diverse social and economic systems.

- Several countries have undertaken studies of their own implementation records with a view to improving their performance. We hope this trend will continue.

- There has been some success in the security area of CSCE, where confidence-building measures have been implemented. Progress in economic, technical and scientific cooperation has also been achieved, notably by the signature last year of the Transboundary Air Pollution Agreement. In both the economic and security areas, progress has been modest, yet the Final Act has served as a catalyst for imaginative thought which bodes well for more ambitious steps when circumstances permit.

- Finally, the situation in and around the divided city of Berlin has remained relatively calm. It is of fundamental importance to European security and cooperation that Berlin continue to receive the full benefits of the Final Act and the Quadripartite Agreement.

Mr. Chairman, as encouraging as this evidence of progress has been, there is a darker side of the record of implementation which must also be considered. In this regard, I must mention first of all the invasion of the independent nation of Afghanistan by armed forces of the Soviet Union, forces which remain in that country even as our meeting convenes. I shall not recite all the provisions of the Final Act -- and indeed, of the U.N. Charter and other solemn agreements -- which this invasion violated. Nor will I pause to refute the transparent explanations which Soviet leaders have offered for their action. I will say only that the Soviet invasion cast a dark shadow over East-West relations which no meeting, no pronouncement, nothing in fact but the total withdrawal of Soviet troops, can dispel.

Were this the only instance in which the obligations of the Final Act had been ignored since our last meeting, our task here would be solemn enough. But this is not the case. As I have cited examples of progress, so must I call attention to a lamentable record of continued denial of human rights written over the past three years by the governments of some signatory nations.

- In the Soviet Union, in direct contravention of the Final Act, Western radio broadcasts -- including those of BBC, Deutsche Welle, the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty -- have been jammed.

- In the German Democratic Republic, a new and punitive increase in required currency exhanges for Western visitors has drastically reduced the ability of West Germans, particularly the elderly and the poor, to visit family and friends in the East.

- In the Soviet Union, the Jewish emigration rate, which encouragingly reached a record high in 1979, has declined in 1980 by 50 percent, while at the same time, harassment and denial of exit permits continue as before.

- In Czechoslovakia, the courageous members of the Charter 77 group, created to monitor compliance with the Helsinki Final Act, have suffered continued harassment and periodic imprisonment. As I speak, Vaclav Havel, a spokesman for this group, is serving out his four-year term under harsh conditions of confinement.

- And in 1976, eleven men and women, citizens of the Soviet Union and long-time activists in the Soviet human rights movement, formed the Moscow Helsinki Watch Group to monitor the implementation of human rights commitments under Principle VII of the Final Act and under Soviet law. Similar groups appeared in the Ukraine, Lithuania, Georgia and Armenia. The reaction of the Soviet authorities was to subject these brave people to

brutal repression. Of the 71 individuals who have belonged to the Soviet Helsinki Watch Groups, 24 have been tried and found guilty, and 19 of them are currently serving a total of 156 years in forced labor camps and exile. Eleven more have been placed under investigative arrest. Nine others were already serving previous sentences when they joined the Helsinki Watch. Seven have emigrated, two were stripped of their citizenship while traveling abroad, one was exchanged for a Soviet spy, and one has died.

I will name only a few members of this remarkable group, but they are representative of all those in the Soviet Union who strive for the rights that are promised them in the Soviet Constitution and in the Helsinki Final Act. All the world knows of Professor Yuri Orlov, the physicist, a courageous man always in the forefront, founder of the Helsinki group. The world also knows of Anatoly Shcharansky, falsely accused of espionage in an attempt to intimidate the Jewish emigration movement. Orlov was sentenced on May 18, 1978, to seven years of strict regimen camp and five years of exile. Shcharansky was sentenced on July 14, 1978, to three years in prison and ten years of strict regimen labor camp. Members of the other groups I have mentioned have met similar fates. In Ukraine and Lithuania, Mykola Rudenko and Viktoras Petkus were also sentenced to long prison terms because they sought fulfillment of Final Act commitments. All those who are free have the inescapable duty to speak out on their behalf and on behalf of the many others.

Finally, I speak of a gentle and compassionate humanist, a man who has devoted his life to helping the poor and the oppressed. Listen to his words: "Despite all that has happened, I feel that the questions of war and peace and disarmament are so crucial that they must be given absolute priority even in the most difficult circumstances. It is imperative that all possible means be used to solve these questions and to lay the groundwork for further progress. Most urgent of all are steps to avert a nuclear war, which is the greatest peril confronting the modern world."

Mr. Chairman, could anyone disagree with those words? Can we not all unite around the thought they express? Do we not all recognize that this thought goes right to the heart of the deepest needs and yearnings of mankind? On January 22 of this year, the author of those words was exiled to the closed city of Gorky in the Soviet Union.

When Andrei Sakharov was banished, some of our best hopes for a spirit of security and cooperation in Europe were banished with him.

There are those who charge that incidents such as these prove the worthlessness of the Final Act. My government strongly disagrees. The fact that a principle has been violated does not make that principle less valid, or reduce our obligation to seek fuller implementation of the Final Act. In that spirit, the United States will make every effort within the context of the Final Act to help create a more secure, a freer and a better life for the one billion people who live within the borders of the states represented here. But CSCE will provide the means to this end only if its provisions are taken seriously - and are seen to be taken seriously by our citizens. Therefore, my country will continue to speak out, in specific terms, against abuses of human rights. We call on all of you to do the same, and to recognize that we cannot expect our citizens to have faith in future commitments if past commitments are ignored.

Mr. Chairman, our expectations for the present meeting are modest. The events I have mentioned have created an international climate which is not conducive to ambitious steps in the areas covered by the Final Act. It would be idle to pretend that CSCE can somehow be insulated from the overall state of East-West relation. Indeed such a pretense could only diminish the importance of the commitments undertaken at Helsinki.

But we do see some possibility of progress. For example, we and our Allies have been doing intensive work to develop confidence-building measures which will be militarily significant, verifiable and applicable to the whole of Europe. We hope that our consideration of such measures at this meeting will point the way toward a more secure future for us all. We are fully prepared to join with you in seeking to realize the full potential of confidence-building measures. We ask only that we concentrate on concrete steps and avoid empty declarations.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, President Carter has asked me to give you the following message: He extends his warmest greetings to the delegates to this historic review meeting. For the President, CSCE is a unique and valuable forum which unites all the nations of Europe, the United States and Canada, in a common effort to rid the world of artificial barriers to the free exercise of human rights and to the free movement of people and ideas across international boundaries. It is his firm conviction that it must be our common goal to preserve and enhance the Helsinki process toward the day when its provisions are fully implemented and true security and cooperation among our nations have finally been achieved.

U.S. STATEMENT ON AFGHANISTAN
REP. DANTE B. FASCELL
VICE CHAIRMAN, U.S. DELEGATION

November 24, 1980

Mr. Chairman:

In the last two weeks, we have heard delegation after delegation rise to condemn the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The invasion of this formerly independent state has severely damaged the international climate. It has done great harm to East-West relations. It has undermined the confidence on which the building of true security and cooperation depends. It has undercut all of the principles of the Helsinki Final Act and negatively affected the atmosphere in which this meeting is taking place.

Almost a year since Soviet troops marched into Afghanistan, the Afghan people are still struggling to free themselves of the reign of violence and oppression which has descended on them, imposed by a foreign army.

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan cannot be reconciled with the principles in the Helsinki Final Act, and it has special relevance to this meeting. The general political basis of our concern is well expressed in the Final Act itself. In the introductory language of Basket I, the participating states recognized "the close link between peace and security in Europe and in the world as a whole." It is obvious that events in Afghanistan cannot be isolated from events in Europe or in the world at large, as the Final Act itself acknowledges. The principles guiding relations among states embodied in the Final Act are as valid and as necessary outside Europe as within. But the Final Act is even more explicit concerning the Declaration of Principles, for the participating states declared their intention to conduct their relations with all other states in the spirit of those principles.

The Declaration of Principles is a virtual catalogue of fundamental tenets of international behavior violated by the Soviet invasion. One could cite the discrepancy between Soviet actions and each of the ten principles of the Final Act. In the interest of brevity, I will confine myself to several principles that were openly flouted:

-- In Principle One, the participating states pledged to respect each other's sovereign equality as well as the rights inherent in sovereignty. Two of the rights specifically mentioned in this regard are the right to territorial integrity and to freedom and political independence. The Soviet invasion violates these rights.

-- Principle Two calls for refraining from the threat or use of force, not only against the participating states, but also in international relations in general. No consideration, the Final Act warns, may be invoked to warrant resorting to the threat or use of force in contravention of this Principle. The Soviet use of force in Afghanistan, from the day of the invasion through this very day, violates this commitment.

-- Principle Three recognizes the inviolability of frontiers. Here the participating states pledged to refrain from assaulting national frontiers and from seizure or usurpation of other states' territory. When it is recalled how hard the Soviet delegation fought for this Principle in the negotiations leading to the Final Act, the Soviet violation of it in Afghanistan is particularly ironic.

-- In Principle Four, the participating states agreed to respect the territorial integrity of states. They pledged to refrain from making the territory of other states the object of military occupation. The Soviet occupation of Afghanistan is a manifest violation of this Principle.

-- The Eastern states have placed great importance on observance of Principle Six, non-intervention in internal affairs. My country shares the belief in its importance, and would note that what this Principle is meant to forbid is precisely what the Soviet Union has done in Afghanistan: commit armed intervention and coercion against another country.

-- The participating states reaffirmed the universal significance of respect for, and effective exercise of, equal rights and self-determination of peoples. This is Principle Eignt, in which they also declared that all peoples always have the right, in full freedom, to determine, when and as they wish, their internal and external political status, without external interference, and to pursue as they wish their political, economic, social and cultural development. All of these commitments are violated by the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan.

I could equally cite the other four Principles of the Final Act infringed upon in greater or lesser degree by the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan. But I think the pattern is clear.

The Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan have struck at the very heart of the Final Act Principles I described. I would now like to examine the objective reality, that is, the concrete Soviet actions in that suffering country as they relate to the Principles.

In late December, 1979, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was launched. Soviet tanks crossed the Afghan border, along with tens of thousands of Soviet troops. The then-leader of the Afghan Government, Hafizullah Amin, was killed after elite Soviet troops attacked his headquarters. Other members of his family and leaders of his government were also killed. Babrak Karmal was installed as leader by Soviet force of arms. The first speech of Babrak to Afghanistan was on a tape, broadcast from a radio station inside the Soviet Union. He did not return to Afghanistan until several days after Soviet forces had seized firm control of Kabul.

The Soviet Union has claimed that its troops were invited into Aghanistan by the Afghan Government, pursuant to the Soviet-Afghan Treaty of Friendship, Good-Neighborliness and Cooperation signed in 1978. Article Four of this Treaty provides that the Soviet Union and Afghanistan shall consult each other and by agreement of the two sides take appropriate measures to ensure the security, independence and territorial integrity of the two countries. Before the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, whom did it consult? Whose agreement did it obtain? As one Islamic diplomat put it, it seems odd that Amin would have invited his own executioner into the country. Was the Soviet Army invited by Babrak Karmal, who was not even in Afghanistan? As I have noted, the Babrak Karmal regime is a pure invention of the Soviet Union, a fiction imposed on the Afghan people without their consent. Obviously, Article Four of the Soviet-Afghan Treaty was not invoked in any genuine way.

I suggest it might be more fruitful for the Soviet Union to review Article One of that same treaty, which is more pertinent. In this Article, the Soviet Union and Afghanistan declared their determination to develop cooperation on the basis of equality, respect for national sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. These are sound Principles, but they were honored in the breach by the Soviet armies.

Nor can any reasonable observer accept the contention that compelling Soviet security concerns caused the invasion. We cannot believe that a small, neutral non-aligned country in any sense threatened the security of the Soviet Union. The argument that the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan as a response to intervention from other countries is also patently false. The only external interference in Afghanistan has come from the Soviet Union itself.

During the opening statements to this meeting, we have heard a few efforts to justify the Soviet actions in Afghanistan. Of the four delegations which spoke in favor of the Soviet invasion, one referred to the "rightfulness and necessity of Soviet assistance to the Afghan people." In view

of the character which that assistance took, the Afghan people may be forgiven for wondering -- with friends like this -- whether they need any enemies. Efforts to defend the Soviet invasion are as hollow and unconvincing today as they ever were. The international community has spoken clearly. Just last week, 111 members of the United Nations General Assembly voted to call for the immediate withdrawal of foreign, that is, Soviet, troops from Afghanistan. This was not the first expression of international opinion on this matter. The Soviet invasion was condemned by 104 nations at the U.N., on January 14 of this year, by the Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers on January 29 and May 21, by the United Nations Human Rights Commission and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) on March 7, and by the Interparliamentary Union Council on April 12 and again on September 24. Surely, it is time for the Soviet Union to go beyond transparent attempts to justify past actions and to move toward the obvious solution repeatedly advanced in international forums.

Some would tell us that the situation in Afghanistan is improving, that we need not concern ourselves with it. In point of fact, the opposite is true. Soviet troops have occupied Afghanistan for nearly a year now. The firepower available to them continues to increase and the Soviet troop level in that country, at least 85,000 strong, is as high today as before the so-called partial troop withdrawal of June 1980. Widespread and spontaneous resistance by the Afghan people continues, attesting to the fact that the Soviet presence and the Babrak regime defy the popular will. Despite this massive military force, the Soviet Union is unable to establish control of the countryside. Control of main population centers and transportation routes between them is tenuous at best.

Moreover, to the extent that the Soviet Union has established control, it has denied a proud nation its independence. Babrak was and remains a Soviet puppet. He has acquired no legitimacy or significant following among his people. Every ministry and government office is permeated by Soviet "advisors" who make or approve all decisions.

The Soviet army of occupation has resorted to escalating violence in an effort to quell the Afghan insurgency. Tactics used include bombing of villages, destruction of crops, helicopter gunship attacks on innocent civilians, dropping of anti-personnel mines which maim their civilian victims, not only in border areas, but also in cultivated fields and villages away from the border. Dissent has been ruthlessly suppressed. As testament to the suffering in Afghanistan, more than one million refugees, nearly ten percent of the Afghan population, have fled their country.

In sum, the situation is one of bloody, brutal repression instigated and perpetuated by the Soviet Union, depriving Afghanistan and its people of their independence and freedom. The Soviet Union has made no movement toward withdrawal. The only solution it has suggested is acceptable neither to the Afghan people nor to neighboring countries. That solution would in effect endorse the illegal military occupation of the country and the Babrak regime.

I return to the preambular language of Basket I of the Final Act. In this section, the participating states stressed the need for each of them to make its contribution to the strengthening of world peace and security. More than any other country at this moment, the Soviet Union has the opportunity and the power to make such a contribution, not in words, but in concrete action in Afghanistan.

Accordingly, the U.S. Delegation and the U.S. Government join many others in calling on the Soviet Union to withdraw promptly from Afghanistan and to allow the brave people of that country to determine their own future. We favor a political settlement which would lead to restoration of a genuinely independent, neutral, non-aligned Afghanistan, with a government acceptable to its people. This can only be accomplished through the prompt withdrawal of all Soviet troops. We have said that we are prepared to consider transitional arrangements to facilitate Soviet withdrawal and appropriate international guarantees. Such a settlement would take into account the legitimate concerns of the Soviet Union in the security of its border.

The opportunity is there. We urge the Soviet Union to take it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT BY
THE HONORABLE ALEXANDER HAIG
U.S. SECRETARY OF STATE

February 9, 1982

We are at a critical crossroads in the postwar history of Europe. Our peoples have invested great hopes in the promise and principles of Helsinki. From Madrid we must send them a clear signal that we are determined to fulfill that promise and to insist upon those principles. Otherwise, the Helsinki Final Act and the process of reconciliation, which it symbolized, will be seriously, perhaps irreparably, damaged. In 1975, thirty-five heads of government committed themselves to heal the wounds and divisions of Europe. Respect for the rights of nations and individuals was to form the basis for much greater security and cooperation. A new era of trust, trade, travel and freedom was to ensue. Europe was to be made whole again.

Now that vision has been fundamentally challenged. As we confront the complexities of the present situation, we might well heed Winston Churchill, who advised that "In critical and baffling situations, it is always best to recur to first principles and simple action." We are indeed in a critical situation. The first principles of the Helsinki Final Act are under attack. My purpose -- and indeed the purpose of this conference -- must be to defend the Act by speaking clearly about what is happening and why. For more than a year, the American delegation, ably directed by Ambassador Kampelman, has sought with others to build on the promise of the Helsinki Final Act. We have discussed our differences, and we have pursued new initiatives. Throughout, our purpose has been to strengthen security and cooperation in Europe. All of these efforts are now overshadowed by ominous events in the heart of Europe itself. The Polish people, whose destiny has always affected European security, are being denied their right to determine their own affairs. A forcible suppression of the Polish search for dignity in the workplace, for freedom, and for self-determination is underway. The generals of this war against the Polish people are none other than the Polish regime itself, acting under the instigation and coercion of the Soviet Union. How can these actions be reconciled with Polish and Soviet signatures on the Helsinki Accords?

Danger to Security and Cooperation in Europe

Nothing endangers security and cooperation in Europe more than the threat and the use of force to deny internationally recognized rights. Nothing endangers the Helsinki Final Act and the Helsinki process more than this willful violation of solemn international obligations. We would be threatening the future peace of Europe if we ignored this dramatic attack on international principles.

Clearly, all countries interested in a more secure, united and open Europe -- the work of this conference -- have a responsibility to raise their voices here today. The American people, and other peoples as well, could never countenance a cynical attempt to place the Polish tragedy beyond the reach of the Helsinki Final Act. To the contrary, the Act justifies our concern and demands our protest. Put most simply the issue is whether we meant what we said in August of 1975.

In Principle I of the Final Act, the signatories said that the states had the rights to choose and develop their political, social, economic and cultural systems. Yet through intimidation and interference, the Soviet Union has conspired with the Polish military authorities to deprive Poland of this basic right.

In Principle II, the signatories said that participating states would refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. Yet Soviet and Warsaw Pact military demonstrations and the palpable fear of Soviet military intervention have been used to intimidate the Polish people in their search for reform.

In Principles IV and VI, the signatories said they would refrain from any action against the political independence of any other participating state and from any intervention in their internal or external affairs. Yet the Polish nation has been the victim of a long and vicious campaign. Official statements, some emanating from the highest levels of the Soviet Government, have warned of dire consequences if the Poles persisted in their pursuit of Polish solutions to Polish problems.

In Principle VII, the signatories said they would promote and encourage the effective exercise of civil, political, economic, social, cultural and other rights and freedoms. But the Polish military authorities, far from promoting and encouraging the exercise of these rights, are suppressing the most fundamental freedoms of the Polish people.

In Principle VIII, the signatories said they would respect the right of peoples freely to determine their political status, without external interference, and to pursue as they wished their political, economic, social and cultural development. Violation of this principle threatens the entire Final Act. Yet since the beginning of the reform movement in Poland, the Soviet Union has attempted systematically to deny the right of the Polish people to chart their own future.

In Principle X, the signatories said that "In exercising their sovereign rights, including the right to determine their laws and regulations, they will conform with their legal obligations under international law..." The suppression of the

civil and human rights of the Polish people violates the internationally recognized rights set forth in the U.N. Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as the specific provisions of the Final Act.

What I have just described is the bill of rights which the Helsinki Final Act provided Western civilization. Thus, the Final Act sets forth basic standards by which to judge ourselves and each other These principles were the product of laborious negotiations. They were solemnly undertaken. My own country's attitude was well expressed by President Ford, when he said:

> "We take this work and these words very seriously. We will spare no effort to ease tensions and solve problems between us. But it is important that you recognize the deep devotion of the American people and their government to human rights and fundamental freedoms and thus to the pledges that this conference has made..."

Pattern of Violations

The United States and many other governments represented here today proudly hold ourselves to these standards. The Helsinki Final Act embodies our rejection of the self-serving sovereignty that equates might with right. It reflects the international consensus that all of the principles are equally binding. No state has the right to arbitrary definition. No state has the right to claim selective exemption. Yet, as we meet today, the exercise of arbitrary power and violence has become a pattern.

Together with many others, the American delegation has detailed here since September 1980 the Soviet Union's continuous and utter disregard for the Helsinki Final Act. Afghanistan has been invaded. Soviet citizens trying to monitor the Soviet Union's compliance with Helsinki have been attacked, imprisoned and placed in mental institutions. Emigration has decreased dramatically. In neighboring Poland, the people now face a ruthless campaign of oppression instigated and supported by the Soviet Union. These are not random acts but systematic policy. Soviet acts have clearly nullified Soviet commitments.

Such acts of oppression and intervention make it impossible to establish conditions for a more free and secure Europe. To ignore them would condemn this conference as a charade. The Helsinki Final Act would be reduced to a worthless piece of paper.

We cannot accept the fallacious argument that legitimate security interests or alliance systems are threatened by a defense of the Helsinki principles. In fact, peaceful change is essential to any durable framework for security. No legitimate government is threatened by freedom and justice. Solidarity with the Polish people and our support for their rights are essential to the survival of the Helsinki process -- and to our own self-respect.

The Need for Constructive Action

The Polish regime and the Soviet Union know very well that they have violated the Helsinki Final Act. They have taken a path inimical to security and cooperation in Europe. It is up to them to demonstrate that they take seriously the principles to which they are pledged.

-- We look for the release from prison of those trade union leaders and others who seek to realize the objectives of the Helsinki Final Act for their people. Promises of good intentions or the mere movement of prisoners to model camps are not enough.

-- We look for the lifting of martial law. This means the end of repressive conditions.

-- We look for reconciliation in Poland. Restoration of internationally recognized rights and a resumption of the process of reform and liberalization provide the only basis for a constructive national dialogue, free from external coercion.

The American people, like those of so many lands, have a special and strong attachment to the people of Poland. No nation has suffered more, nor displayed such enduring courage. Relief from current oppression is not enough - the Polish people want more, need more, deserve more. The United States has decided to join other concerned countries in offering a major program to help Poland overcome its economic problems, including agricultural shortages and massive external debt. This assistance will become available when the basic rights of the Polish people are restored and their quest for a more decent society resumed.

We will not aid tyranny. But if tyranny stand aside, we are ready to help. It is up to the Polish military regime and the Soviet Union to create and to maintain the conditions in which the Polish people can, with Western assistance, rebuild their economy.

As these conditions are restored, we also will be among the first to insist that we return to the job of reaching agreement on moving the Helsinki process forward in both the human rights and security areas. In the meantime, business as usual here at

Madrid would simply condone the massive violations of the Final Act now occurring in Poland. These violations -- part of a broader pattern of Soviet lack of restraint -- threaten the very basis of this conference. We cannot pretend to build up the structure of peace and security here in Madrid while the foundation for that structure is being undermined in Poland. How can the United States return to negotiations on new words and new undertakings while existing obligations are being so blatantly ignored?

Vision of Helsinki

Today, our deliberations must focus instead on the challenges to the integrity of the Final Act and the CSCE process. To do otherwise would endanger successful negotiations, if and when circumstances permit, on the basis of the constructive proposal tabled by the neutral and nonaligned states last fall. Even more fundamentally, it would dishonor the Final Act and our commitment to uphold it.

I want to conclude by quoting from the Polish bishops who wrote recently that "Real peace stems from respect for freedom and the correct understanding of everyone's right to freedom." This lies at the heart of the Helsinki process. In the final analysis, peace and security in Europe depend on respect for the freedom of nations and individuals in Europe. Recognition of this fact is the key to the removal of the barriers dividing East and West.

Freedom is the proudest achievement of Western civilization. It was given recent expression in the successful and peaceful transition to democracy in Portugal and here in Spain. The vision of man as a creative and responsible individual has flourished despite the artificial divisions decreed by ideologues and dictators. Western ideals nourish all the nations of Europe, not only those members of the Atlantic world. After a quarter century of iron curtain and cold war, the Helsinki Final Act promised a new era because it was based on this unifying vision of man.

But the ideals of the West are in danger if their defense is not considered vital by the nations of Europe. The process of reconciliation can be halted if we ignore the acts that betray our faith. The structure of security and cooperation can collapse if we avert our eyes from the undermining of its foundation. Only respect for freedom will insure the survival and flourishing of Western civilization.

REMARKS OF
SENATOR ROBERT DOLE
VICE CHAIRMAN, U.S. DELEGATION

November 23, 198

Mr. Chairman:

Today we meet in the shadow of a fallen leader; on behalf of my colleagues and the American people we represent, may I extend to the Soviet delegation our condolences on the death of President Brezhnev. To General Secretary Andropov and the Soviet delegation, I would like to convey our hope that together we might transform this moment of international uncertainty into one of opportunity.

But before going further, may I also express our appreciation to the Government of Spain for the outstanding work it has done in playing host to this meeting. I doubt whether any delegation could have anticipated that this second follow-up meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe would last over two years -- a period of time eased considerably, I am told, by the generous hospitality and smooth organization of our Spanish hosts. As Vice-Chairman of the United States delegation, I would like to convey my gratitude.

It is both a pleasure and a challenge for me to share my thoughts on the CSCE process, along with those of my colleagues in the United States Senate. A pleasure because the very dialogue that takes place in this hall is one instrument of a peaceful world. Initiated in Helsinki, maintained in Belgrade, and now continued in Madrid, this frank exchange of views may sometimes seem to illuminate our differences more than to resolve them -- but how much better it is to throw a light on matters otherwise confined to the dark rooms of suspicion or distrust.

It is a challenge as well for me to address you this afternoon, for there are issues that divide the nations represented here. And in the United States there is substantial interest, both public and congressional, that attaches to these proceedings. This reflects the American desire to enhance East-West security through arms control and to strengthen economic cooperation as much as possible. And it reflects a sentiment noted by President Ford when he signed the Final Act: "The deep devotion of the American people and government to human rights and fundamental freedoms and to the pledge this Conference has made regarding the freer movement of people, ideas and information."

To the American people, such words speak to the heart of those principles written into the charters of their freedom. They suggest a time and a world where no one wields a sword and no one drags a chain. And they provide a powerful incentive to follow closely, not only what you and we say here in Madrid, but what you and we do after this conference takes its place in the thick volume of modern diplomatic history.

The United States is a nation of nations, an immigrant crossroads. The ancestors of most Americans have their roots in European nations, East and West. Along with those roots goes a continuing interest in their national heritage, and in the fate of those who continue to live in the lands of their parents and grandparents. But in many of those lands, the aspirations for liberty that served as a midwife to the infant American republic, over 200 years ago, have too often been frustrated. For us to lose our interest in the liberty of others would be to disregard the guiding light of our history and heritage. And while the American people retain an undiminished faith in the Helsinki process itself, they are disaffected, perhaps to the point of disillusionment, with the lack of compliance on the part of some signatories.

Five years ago, on November 25, 1977, I had the privilege of addressing the CSCE Review Meeting in Belgrade. I expressed the opinion at that time that a direct connection existed between public perceptions of the integrity of the commitments made at Helsinki and the ability of Western Governments to carry forward the process known as detente. I also stated the conviction that abridgements of human rights, in particular, could have a profound negative impact on pending prospective bilateral and multilateral agreements between East and West. Sadly, many events since than have only increased my concern. Today, in many minds and many countries, people are looking urgently for changes in the actions of many of the signatories. Nowhere is this search keener than in America.

I have just returned from the Soviet Union where the improvement of U.S.-Soviet trade relations was widely discussed. With several of my colleagues from Congress, I took part in the meetings of the U.S.-Soviet Business Council, where scores of international businessmen expressed their interest in renewed and closer East-West economic ties. I also met with Prime Minister Tikhonov, Acting President Kuznetsov, and many other Soviet officials who were clearly eager to find a way for us to improve relations not only in trade but in other areas as well, including arms control.

What I said in Moscow I will say here. The U.S. Congress and the American people seek to develop genuine cooperation with all the European countries, no matter what their social system. East-West harmony is a fundamental objective of

American foreign policy. The opportunities to achieve that harmony can be enlarged by what we do here in Madrid, within the framework of the CSCE. Yet, how can we make progress without abiding by the Final Act's provisions? How, ask our scientists, can we engage in cooperative scientific endeavors, while Soviet scientists are prohibited from working in their fields, and while Dr. Andrei Sakharov, the world-famous physicist, remains in exile? How, ask our labor leaders, can we increase industrial cooperation when the Polish government outlaws the free trade union Solidarity? How, ask our religious leaders, can we promote expanded religious contacts when some of their co-religionists languish in labor camps and prisons?

What we have is a crisis of confidence: the American people cannot reconcile these harsh realities with the noble ideals embodied in the Final Act and espoused by its signatories. They expect us to live up to our word.

There have been some bright spots in the last seven years. Important efforts have been made by a number of Eastern signatories to resolve outstanding family reunification cases, indicating some movement to take seriously the Final Act pledge to "deal in a positive and humanitarian spirit with persons who wish to be reunited with members of their family."

Similarly, travel restrictions to Eastern bloc countries by Western citizens for family visits have been eased. In countries such as the German Democratic Republic, Hungary and Poland, steps to explore church-state relations were taken, consistent with the commitment in the Final Act to expand religious freedom. Other positive actions have been taken by Czechoslovakia, Hungary and the German Democratic Republic in the area of religious contacts and the dissemination of religious information. Progress in economic, technical and scientific cooperation has been achieved. In the security area of CSCE, confidence-building measures generally have been implemented. Finally, a number of signatories have studied their own implementation records and have analyzed ways in which they can be improved.

Although much more work needs to be done in these areas, at least some concrete progress has been made. As a result, tensions have been eased and potential areas of concern have been at least somewhat lessened. These bright spots, unfortunately, are overshadowed by a dark canopy of regression.

The evidence of this is both tragic and compelling. The hopeful transformation of political and social life that had begun in Poland has been all but destroyed with the imposition of martial law, and we know that the Soviet Union has been instrumental in this. Recent actions, such as the banning of Solidarity, have done nothing to restore confidence in Polish

and Soviet fidelity to their Final Act obligations. Americans and many others are, of course, most pleased with the recent release of Lech Walesa. We also look forward to a renewal of the precious dialogue that briefly warmed relations between the Government of Poland and the Polish people.

Sadly, not all the prisoners of politics have gone free. In the Soviet Union, members of the Helsinki monitoring groups -- who took seriously their own country's Helsinki pledge and their recognition in the Final Act that "institutions, organizations and individuals have a relevant and positive role" to play in fostering the aims of the accords -- have suffered harsh reprisals: 38 currently imprisoned members of the Moscow, Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Georgian and Armenian groups are now serving a combined total of almost 400 years in prison, labor camps, special psychiatric hospitals and internal exile. Indeed, in this very month, Americans are commemorating the sixth anniversary of the establishment of the Ukrainian and Lithuanian Helsinki groups, both of which have been particularly hard hit.

Moreover, emigration from the Soviet Union has reached its lowest point in ten years: less than 5,000 Soviet Jews, ethnic Germans, Armenians and others are likely to be granted exit permission this year, or roughly one-twelfth of the number that received permission to leave as recently as 1979. There are also tragic cases of separation from loved ones, as illustrated by the divided family hunger strikes that took place this summer in Moscow. Furthermore, jamming of Western radio broadcasts has not ceased. No one would be surprised that these violations have severely damaged the credibility of the Soviet Government in the eyes of the American people. And this factor has spilled over into other areas of negotiation including trade and arms control. For us, and for our allies, the quest for disarmament and the search for peace is inextricably interwoven with respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. The two go hand in hand.

Pretending that the problems we have noted do not exist will not make them disappear. On the other hand, genuine moves towards fulfilling the promises of Helsinki would provide a favorable climate for reconciliation of a wide range of differences between us. The acceptance of proposals outlined in the Western package of amendments, particularly those dealing with human rights and family reunification, would be a start.

Also, the release of interned trade unionists and other political prisoners in Poland, the lifting of martial law, and the renewal of dialogue between the three major sectors of Polish society -- the government, the church and Solidarity -- would be highly welcome. The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan would help further to rebuild the confidence on which true security and cooperation depends.

The United States, and especially those of us in Congress, would encourage the Soviet Union to take a series of further steps that would be viewed positively throughout the West. Among them are: (1) the easing of impediments to emigration; (2) the resolution of long-term family reunification and binational marriage cases; (3) the release of imprisoned or exiled members of the Helsinki monitoring groups, especially those with severe health problems, and a halt to the harassment of these groups; (4) the restoration of direct dial telephone circuits; (5) an improvement in the availability of economic and commercial information; (6) the improvement in working conditions for journalists; and (7) a halt to jamming Western radio broadcasts.

We of the United States realize that the path towards the ideals of the Helsinki Final Act is strewn with obstacles. We recognize the imperfections of our own country; we acknowledge a need to improve our own behavior. We are not afraid to admit our shortcomings. For that is the catalyst of progress, the first indispensable step on the road to achievement. Various sectors of our government as well as private individuals and organizations are engaged in continuing dialogue on how to move closer to the ideals we have espoused. Like the CSCE process itself, ours is an ongoing and earnest dialogue. Although at times our words both at home and here with you take on a sharp tone, they are far better than silence.

Mr. Chairman, let me assure the delegations here that the United States will continue to work toward the harmony I described earlier -- a harmony that has proved elusive but remains essential to the interests of us all. I hope those efforts might succeed, and that I might attend the next follow-up meeting of the CSCE in an atmosphere that reflects the achievement of enhanced cooperation and indeed, of lasting security in Europe.

To that end, I challenge all of us gathered here today to seize the opportunity this moment offers for a decisive step toward enduring peace. For five days last week in Moscow, high officials of the Soviet government told me that they strongly desired a new and better relationship with us and our allies. Last night, President Reagan reaffirmed his commitment to far-reaching arms control objectives -- a clear signal of our willingness, in turn, to open a new era of mutual confidence and cooperation between East and West. We can demonstrate, by concrete actions, our full good faith and our will to reach toward security and lasting freedom for all mankind.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Addendum E

STATEMENT BY
MAX M. KAMPELMAN
CHAIRMAN, U.S. DELEGATION

July 18, 1983

Thank you, Mr. Chairman:

After two years and more than ten months of negotiation, we are close to the end of our Madrid meeting.

We have just been informed by the delegate from Malta that he intends, as is his right, to continue to pursue the amendments about which he has fully informed us. He is aware that our delegation, among others, will continue to oppose those amendments and will not provide the necessary consensus to them

The American delegation is pleased with the Draft Concluding Document that has emerged out of our deliberations. We consider it noteworthy that in a number of respects, such as in provisions dealing with the reunification of families, religious rights, trade unions, terrorism, rights of journalists, access to missions, and Helsinki monitors, the Madrid document goes beyond the Helsinki Final Act of 1975.

We also consider the decision to hold a Conference on Security and Confidence Building to be important. This can be a significant step toward strengthening security and cooperation in Europe. The need to minimize the risk of surprise military attack is of great significance to all of us. We welcome a decision to hold such a conference, a proposal we joined in supporting as early as February, 1981.

We look for a conference which will produce more than vaguely worded declarations. We take very seriously the provisions in the mandate that the conference would concern itself with confidence and security building measures which are militarily significant, politically binding, verifiable, and applicable to the whole of Europe. The conference must complement, and not interfere, with other arms control negotiations. The United States will take a constructive approach to the work of the conference, and hopes that others will do the same. Agreement to notify military activities which will take place on land in Europe is an example of the kind of measure we believe could be a valuable result of this conference.

It is also gratifying to all of us that Madrid is firmly establishing the continuity of the Helsinki process. We have done so explicitly; and we are doing so with our decision to hold another follow-up meeting in Vienna in 1986, preceded by a tenth anniversary meeting in Helsinki in 1985. This continuity

is strengthened by a decision to hold meetings, between the sessions in Madrid and Vienna, on human rights, human contacts, cultural activities, the Mediterranean and the peaceful resolution of international disputes.

The United States recognizes the special importance of arriving at an agreement in Madrid at a time when international tensions and differences continue to dominate our consciousness. We hope Madrid will be a significant signal of a new beginning in our earnest pursuit of peace.

We must, however, not be blind to the difficulties of the task ahead. These difficulties were dramatized by a first-page editorial in the July 14 issue of Pravda, which I read shortly after leaving this hall on Friday, when 34 of us signified our provisional approval of a final document. The editorial sharpens for us not only the real meaning of the Madrid Agreement, but its decided limitations as well.

The editorial's theme is the speech made to the June Plenum of the Communist Party Central Committee by the leader of the Soviet Union, during which he said: "There is a struggle for the hearts and minds of billions of people on this planet." Concerned that the USSR may not be doing too well in that struggle, Pravda urges that Soviet citizens be "immunized" against hostile ideas. Specifically, it aims at religion in the USSR as a danger.

The United States understands the profound serious- ness of the inherent contradictions between the Soviet totalitarian system and the system of liberty and individual dignity which is a hallmark of democratic governments. Reaching agreements such as we did in Helsinki and now in Madrid, do not, by themselves, automatically minimize those differences or end the competition.

We intend to be in the competition for "hearts and minds" to which Pravda refers. We welcome a competition of ideas and values. In many ways the Madrid forum has been and remains a vehicle for that competition. What concerns us deeply, however, is that the Soviet Union may believe that it cannot win a competition of ideas and values without the threat and use of armed force and repression, both within and outside its borders.

The Helsinki Final Act and the Madrid Agreement are efforts to channel the competition of values within civilized constraints; and at the same time to strive for understanding so that we can learn to live with one another in peace. The fact that these agreements continue to be violated, even during this very period of negotiation and agreement, is discouraging.

We cannot in good conscience permit a limited negotiating success, important as we believe it to be, to make us forget, much to our regret, that signatures on a document do not necessarily produce compliance with its provisions. The continued fighting in Afghanistan, where more than 100,000 invading troups remain, violating the sovereignty of that unhappy country and abusing the humanity of its people, stands as an affront to the peace we in Helsinki professed to pursue.

The people of Poland remain today subjugated by a martial law which attacked the legitimacy of their free trade union, Solidarity, and continues to keep in internment and imprisonment thousands of persons who declare and champion their human rights.

Our delegation believes in the importance of words. But we cannot permit an agreement on words to obfuscate unpleasant realities.

We have sought and welcome the agreement represented by our decision in Madrid. We do not wish to minimize the importance of that agreement. But we also do not wish to minimize the consequence of undermining such agreements when they are not complied with in letter and in spirit.

What are we to think when at the very time we were coming to agreement on provisions dealing with religious rights, Pravda Vostoka of Uzbekistan informed us that leading members of the Seventh Day Adventist Church have been imprisoned by government authorities, precisely because of their wish to practice their religion?

Mr. Chairman, on December 1, 1981, I reluctantly brought to the attention of this body a detailed report of what clearly appeared to be a government-sponsored anti-Jewish campaign in the Soviet Union. It was my hope, obviously misplaced, that I would never have reason to raise that issue again. The facts, however, force me to do so.

The decline in Soviet Jewish immigration is to the lowest levels since the 1960's, a tragic violation of the Helsinki accords. An important escape valve has thus been cut off for one of the most persecuted religious groups in that society. We note too, with sadness, that many Jewish scientists and professionals have been stripped of their educational degrees; that the teaching of the Hebrew language brings on police harassment and arrest; and, perhaps most disturbing of all, that extreme anti-Semitic articles are appearing in the Soviet press with increasing frequency.

Soviet officials sometimes respond to these facts with assertions of "indignation" and "libel". I fully understand such indignation in the light of the horren- dous memories of anti-Semitism during and prior to World War II. As to libel, in many of our societies truth is a defense to a charge of libel. We pray that this issue may soon disappear as an issue between us. Until the facts justify that change, however, I quote from a statement made last week by President Reagan: "We have repeatedly stated that our concern for human rights in general, and Soviet Jewry in particular, is integral to our national interest and remains a major focus of our national policy."

The picture is no more encouraging when we turn to the very marrow of our objectives, the search for peace.

A Soviet pacifist, Alexander Shatravka, was recently sentenced to three years in prison for circulating a petition calling for the universal abolition of nuclear weapons. The document had urged both the United States and the Soviet Union to scrap their nuclear arsenals. Mr. Shatravka had earlier been associated with a group of young people, who, a year ago, had been arrested for unfurling a banner in Red Square bearing only the Russian words for "bread - life - disarmament."

The arrest of these young Soviet citizens seeking peace stands in sharp contrast to the enthusiastic editorial which appeared in Pravda last January hailing anti-war movements in Western Europe as "vital causes of the people." Is it any wonder that we are reminded of a perceptive statement by Clausewitz: "The aggressor" he said, "is always peace loving. He would like to make his entry into our country undisturbed."

We know that the people of the Soviet Union, like all of our peoples, are peace loving. But we also know from the Pravda editorial of last week that Soviet authorities, who are not elected by their people, fear independent ideas and want their people "immunized" against them. General Aleksei Yepishev, the political head of the Soviet Army, recently complained that Soviet youth was being infected by pacifism. To stop independent ideas is a lost cause. Ideas, like the wind currents and the climate, reach all lands and cannot be stopped by artificial barriers.

It is the view of our delegation, Mr. Chairman, that in arresting and harassing those of its citizens who work for peace and universal nuclear disarmament, Soviet authorities not only maintain an indefensible double standard, they clearly demonstrate that the mantle of peace, in which they would like to cloak themselves, simply does not fit their shape, their ideology, or their practices, and it is not simply, Mr. Chairman, one country that we wish to address these comments.

Similarly, a few weeks ago, more than 300 Czechoslovak young people were clubbed by the police, with many arrested, for holding a peace demonstration in Prague and chanting "we want peace and freedom." And in that country, Ladislav Lis, a spokesman for the Charter 77 human rights and peace organization, a Helsinki monitoring group, is expected to go on trial this week for his activities. Religious believers are also facing renewed repression for their expressions of faith.

In East Germany, where there is a growing unofficial peace movement that opposes all nuclear arms, including those of the Soviet Union and the United States, young people, many of them associated with churches, also find themselves harassed. At least 22 members of this group have recently been expelled. Patches worn on clothing depicting "swords into plowshares," distributed by East German church leaders, have been outlawed as "the expression of a mentality hostile to the state and proof of membership in an illegal political association." Students wearing the patch were threatened with expulsion from their schools and workers from their jobs.

The irony is not lost on us as we remind ourselves that the statue of peace given by Moscow to the United Nations has the same motif of "swords into plowshares."

A double irony is that the harassment of those who try to demonstrate for peace stands in stark contradic- tion to a United Nations General Assembly resolution of last December, co-sponsored by the United States, calling on all states "to encourage their citizens freely and publicly to express their own views on disarmament changes and to organize and to meet publicly for that purpose."

Once again, we have words; and we have deeds contrary to those words. We have the continuation of a pattern which has plagued the Helsinki process since 1975, and which continues to plague this meeting to this day.

The question might well be asked, therefore, and many in my country understandably ask, why do we negotiate about words? Why do we seek to forge a concluding document? Why do we enter into an agreement at a time when the repression of human beings in the Soviet Union is greater than at any time since the Helsinki Accords were signed in 1975?

Mr. Chairman, the American delegation has pursued these activities here in Madrid because the pursuit of peace is too vital, the need for understanding too indispensible, the importance of the Helsinki Accords too great to permit us to be discouraged by the task or by the obstacles we face.

We are convinced that the Helsinki Final Act has within it a formula for peace which is indispensible in this age of potential nuclear devastation. It is our conviction, furthermore, that unless these principles are taken seriously, the accords will become historically irrelevant. We, therefore, continue to express ourselves on this issue, even during these closing days of our meeting, in order to help mobilize a wider moral and political insistance upon universal respect for the Act by compliance with its provisions. Anything less threatens the integrity of our process and of our relationships under it.

The American delegation makes this statement today not to irritate or offend any delegation here. We understand the need for patience in building the structure of peace and understanding among us. We cannot, however, lull our publics into believing that words alone are adequate to erase the pressing threats to the integrity of the Helsinki and Madrid principles.

We earnestly desire to enter into a constructive dialogue at all levels in order to achieve understanding and restore the "detente" contemplated in the Helsinki accords. We wish to negotiate reductions in arms of all kinds to ease the burdens of military spending on all of us. We wish peace with every state here. We wish to resolve all potential conflicts between us, bilateral, regional, and international. We seek to do so on the basis of reciprocity and mutuality.

We appreciate that in order to have a successful dialogue, we must be as attentive and responsive to the concerns of others as we ask them to be with respect to ours. We are prepared to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude with an extract from a statement issued by President Reagan in Washington last Friday evening:

"In concluding the Madrid meeting, we reaffirm our commitment to the Helsinki process. We will not flag in our continued determination to work with all governments and peoples whose goal is the strengthening of peace in freedom. As Madrid has shown, dialogue, when based on realistic expectations and conducted with patience, can produce results. These results are often gradual and hard-won but they are the necessary building blocks for a more secure and stable world. The challenge remains: we must all consolidate and build on these gains; we must ensure that good words are transformed into good deeds and that the ideals which they embody are given concrete expression. Giving substance to the promises of Madrid and Helsinki will remain one of our prime objectives."

Thank you.

STATEMENT BY
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ
U.S. SECRETARY OF STATE

September 9, 1983

Mr. Chairman, ministers and colleagues, ladies and gentlemen:

Spain, our gracious and creative host, has made a successful -- and inspiring -- transition to democracy. That success reminds us by its example that the light of freedom can never be extinguished and that the aspiration to human dignity is basic to all peoples. This is what the Helsinki process is all about. That is why the United States supports continuation of the process, strengthened as it is by what has been accomplished.

But we also meet at a time when basic human rights remain widely denied, and in the immediate aftermath of a brutal tragedy, shocking to the conscience of mankind. The Korean Airline massacre reminds us all of the extent to which the objectives of the CSCE process remain to be achieved. Our meeting here must therefore mark -- as statement after statement of Ministers have done -- renewed determination in the pursuit of these fundamental objectives.

The Helsinki Process

Mr. Chairman, the Helsinki process was launched with great hopes ten years ago. It was born at what seemed to be an encouraging moment in East-West relations: The United States and the Soviet Union had just reached the first agreements on strategic arms limitation. Broad vistas of economic cooperation appeared open. Progress seemed possible on human rights. There was an awareness that lasting peace required us to look at the totality of our relations. And so Helsinki was an attempt to deal comprehensively with the problems of security, economic relations, contacts between our peoples, their basic freedoms and standards of international conduct.

The Helsinki F nal Act is an eloquent statement of aspirations, to which the United States gladly subscribed because we subscribe to every one of its principles:

-- It affirms the most fundamental human rights: liberty of thought, conscience and faith; the exercise of civil and political rights; the rights of minorities.

-- It calls for a freer flow of information, ideas and people; greater scope for the press; cultural and educational exchange; family reunification; the right to travel and to marriage between nationals of different states; protection of the priceless heritage of our diverse cultures.

-- And it reaffirms the basic principles of relations between states: nonintervention, sovereign equality, self-determination, territorial integrity and the inviolability of frontiers other than through peaceful change.

The United States has always been realistic about the Helsinki process. We did not expect it to resolve all of the difficult security issues we face in an era of ideological conflict and military competition. We knew, from the beginning, that some would distort it to reinforce the division of the continent and the domination of Eastern Europe by the Soviet Union, despite the Final Act's clear reaffirmation of freedom, political independence, sovereignty, self-determination and noninterference.

Thus, when heads of state and government met in Helsinki in 1975 to conclude the first Conference and sign the Final Act, the United States took the position that hope had to be tempered by realism and backed up by effort. President Ford expressed it well on that occasion:

> "History will judge this Conference not by what we say here today, but by what we do tommorrow -- not by the promises we make, but by the promises we keep."

Since 1975

Reflecting on the experience of the last eight years, we must be disappointed, but we cannot be surprised, that the years since then have seen many setbacks for our efforts to strengthen security, expand cooperation, build mutual confidence and protect human rights.

The record speaks for itself:

-- There are governments in the East which have from the outset treated their commitments to human rights under the Final Act with open contempt. The Helsinki monitoring groups that citizens created to gauge their governments' performance have been systematically suppressed. Emigration, after an initial rise, has fallen dramatically. Dissidents have been subjected to ever more brutal treatment. And courageous men and women who dared to assert their human rights -- or demonstrate for peace and arms control -- are rotting in prison or condemned to mental hospitals.

-- Similarly, within two years of signing the document pledging a commitment to the pursuit of peace, the Soviet Union began deploying SS-20 intermediate-range nuclear missiles with multiple warheads on each, aimed at the peoples of Europe and Asia, endangering the balance of power and creating an enormous security problem.

-- Six years after signing a document pledging a commitment to sovereignty, independence and self-determination, the Soviet Union coerced Poland into suppressing a free trade union movement whose only crime was to take workers' rights seriously in what claims to be a workers' state.

-- And most recently, just days after accepting here a new document of still stronger commitments than those of the Final Act, the Soviet Union has ruthlessly taken the lives of 269 innocent people on a defenseless civilian airplane. And from this rostrum, its Foreign Minister shamelessly insisted that the Soviet Union would do so again, thus again demonstrating its callous disregard for human life.

The Basis for Security and Cooperation in Europe

These blatant acts of Soviet defiance against the spirit and the letter of the Helsinki Accords have presented this Madrid meeting with its basic challenge. By accepting that challenge and insisting on injecting an element of accountability into the process, Madrid has saved the Act from becoming an historic irrelevancy.

Let us look at the ideals of Helsinki as they relate to the realities of today.

In the security field, we and our allies seek to enhance European security at the lowest possible levels of arms. We are energetically involved in all ongoing negotiations. We welcome the newly scheduled conference on confidence- and security-building measures and disarmament. We know that the essence of security is mutual security. Unfortunately, as the fate of Korean Airlines Flight 007 once again reminds us, the Soviet Union defines its security in a way so absolute, self-centered and cynical that it poses a danger to all other countries.

The SS-20's targeted on Western Europe and Asia dramatize the danger to us all. These missiles threaten international confidence and international stability. They are part of a steady and continuing Soviet aim for global military power far beyond any conceivable defensive needs. Their deployment began in 1977. On November 2, 1977, after about a dozen of these

weapons had been deployed, Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev declared: "We do not want to upset the approximate equilibrium at present ... between East and West in Central Europe, or between the USSR and the United States." Whether or not one agreed on the precise nature of the military balance at that point, a natural question arises as to why the Soviet Union has proceeded since 1977 to deploy more SS-20's at a feverish pace, for a present total of over 350 launchers and over 1,050 warheads. If there was balance then with a dozen or so weapons, it is difficult to deny that, today there must be an imbalance that requires redress.

That balance will be redressed by the Atlantic Alliance in the absence of an equal, verifiable agreement to limit them. The Soviet response to this, unfortunately, has been less genuine negotiation and more unilateral threats. The democratic nations will resist such threats, which poison the atmosphere and are inconsistent with the genuine pursuit of security and cooperation. If no agreement is reached by the end of this year, NATO counterdeployments will begin. But we, for our part, are willing to keep on trying to reach agreement with the Soviet Union.

In addition to tipping the military balance, the Soviet Union and its allies embarked -- in the immediate aftermath of the Helsinki Final Act -- on a course of geopolitical aggression in Africa, the Middle East and Southwest Asia. Cuban armies under Soviet direction intervened in Angola, Ethiopia and South Yemen; Vietnamese armies invaded Kampuchea, pioneering in the technology of chemical and toxin warfare against civilians; and the Soviet Army invaded Afghanistan.

The United States is fully aware that the Final Act stresses "the close link between peace and security in Europe and in the world as a whole." We will work with those who seek peaceful solutions to regional conflicts, consistent with the desires and interests of the peoples concerned, in Southeast and Southwest Asia, in Southern Africa and in Central America and the Caribbean.

We support that provision of the Final Act which treats economic relations as "an essential sector" of cooperation. But "their cooperation in this field," says the Final Act, "should take place in full respect for the principles guiding relations among participating States." The steady growth in East-West economic exchanges that marked the early 1970's has slowed and leveled off. The geopolitical developments I have just mentioned have contributed to this drop. But it is partly the result as well of the oil crisis and world economic recession; and partly the result of the structural inefficiencies of the East's central economic planning.

It is ironic that a system claiming to exemplify the principles of the world's only truly "scientific" economic theory should have to resort to emulating Western methods, borrowng Western funds, and purchasing Western food and technology, in order to sustain its performance. Nevertheless, we continue to hope that non-strategic trade, proceeding on sound commercial terms, can make at least some long-range contribution to constructive East-West relations.

In reaching the vital question of human rights, the central point to make is that they are not just a separate "basket" of issues but an integral part of the whole subject of security and cooperation. As the Final Act declares, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms is "an essential factor for the peace, justice and well-being necessary to ensure the development of friendly relations and cooperation."

Here we arrive at the heart of the matter. What is the real reason that progress in the Helsinki process is such an uphill struggle? What is it that security and cooperation in Europe fundamentally depend upon? What are the real, basic obstacles to security and cooperation in Europe?

It all comes down to the question: Why is Europe divided?

We all know the answer. Europe was divided by force, and it remains divided by force -- the force of a system that as a matter of both principle and practice is opposed to the free movement of people and ideas. This is a system that built a wall to keep ideas out and people in. This is a system that fears foreign radio broadcasts even more, perhaps, than it fears missiles.

Yet experience has shown that no wall is high enough, no jamming station strong enough, to keep out ideas or to keep down the hopes of men and women who yearn for freedom. The division of Europe is today, as it always was, unnatural and inhuman. Therefore, the attempt to keep Europe divided by raw power is inevitably a source of instability. There can be no lasting security or cooperation in Europe as long as one government is afraid of its own people and seeks reassurance in imposing a system of force on its people -- and on its neighbors.

There will always be heroes who will not let us forget, and who give their would-be masters no rest: Polish workers, Czech intellectuals, East German clergy and peace demonstrators, and Soviet dissidents of all faiths and from all walks of life who risk life and livelihood for the cause of liberty. The Soviet Union would earn great credit for itself in the spirit of Helsinki if it allowed these heroes who want to leave the Soviet Union to do so. The right to emigrate is a vital principle acknowledged in the Universal Declaration of Human

Rights. As this Jewish New Year begins, let us hope that the coming year will see major progress toward freer emigration. Yet our concern is not only for those who wish to leave but for those who remain. The condition of their lives, in the spirit of Helsinki and Madrid, is an important barometer of the true condition of security and cooperation in Europe.

In the most profound sense, the Helsinki process represents an historic effort to erode the cruel divisions between East and West in Europe. It is an effort that must continue because it embodies the most basic interests, deepest convictions and highest hopes of all the peoples of Europe. Though this conference is coming to a close, our concern for human rights is enduring, and we will continue to advance this cause in every appropriate forum. We will continue to speak the truth. The struggle for human rights is unstoppable, and it remains a priority of American foreign policy.

Madrid and the Future

As the Madrid review meeting nears its end, I want to pay tribute here to the able leadership of the distinguished head of our delegation, Ambassador Max M. Kampelman. In speaking to this meeting, he spoke for a united country, for an American people united in support of peace and united in its commitment to human dignity. And he helped with others to forge the unity among the Western democracies without which even the modest progress we have made would have been impossible.

After almost three years of patient negotiation, we have a document that, when approved, will expand and improve upon the 1975 Final Act. It adds important new commitments with respect to human rights, trade union freedoms, religious liberties, reunification of families, free flow of information and measures against terrorism. It also provides, significantly, for follow-up in the human rights and security fields:

-- A human rights meeting is scheduled in Ottawa in 1985, a meeting on human contacts in Bern in early 1986, and a full review conference in Vienna in late 1986. We hope that the Soviet Union will at long last pay heed to the concerns frequently expressed by many of us in Madrid and respond to those concerns.

-- A conference on confidence- and security-building measures and disarmament will convene in Stockholm in early 1984. The United States will negotiate seriously to reach agreement on militarily significant, politically binding, and verifiable measures applicable to the whole of Europe. We also look forward to the meeting of experts on the peaceful settlement of disputes scheduled for Athens in 1984.

The presence here of a distinguished Congressional delegation signifies the dedication of my country to the Helsinki process and to the quest for security and cooperation in Europe.

We challenge the Soviet Union to undertake a serious dialogue on the full range of outstanding issues, with the goal of settling problems and reducing tensions. For our part, we will continue to negotiate patiently in good faith and will consider any proposals that meet our basic objective of enhancing true security and cooperation.

As sober realists, we are -- and must be -- prepared for continued and often arduous competition. Yet we also believe that this competition can -- and must be -- conducted in a way that leaves room for practical agreements that push back the specter of major conflict. In the nuclear age, this is our mutual responsibility. It is my government's solemn commitment.

As President Reagan declared last July 15:

"We will not flag in our continued determination to work with all governments and peoples whose goal is the strengthening of peace in freedom. As Madrid has shown, dialogue, when based on realistic expectations and conducted with patience, can produce results. These results are often gradual and hard won, but they are the necessary building blocks for a more secure and stable world."

Thank you very much.

CONCLUDING DOCUMENT

OF THE MADRID MEETING 1980 OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PARTICIPATING STATES OF THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE, HELD ON THE BASIS OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE FINAL ACT RELATING TO THE FOLLOW-UP TO THE CONFERENCE

The representatives of the participating States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe met in Madrid from 11 November 1980 to 9 September 1983 in accordance with the provisions of the Final Act relating to the Follow-up to the Conference, as well as on the basis of the other relevant documents adopted during the process of the CSCE.

The participants were addressed on 12 November 1980 by the Spanish Prime Minister.

Opening statements were made by all Heads of Delegations among whom were Ministers and Deputy Ministers of Foreign Affairs of a number of participating States. Some Ministers of Foreign Affairs addressed the Meeting also at later stages.

Contributions were made by representatives of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) and UNESCO.

Contributions were also made by the following non-participating Mediterranean States: Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Morocco and Tunisia.

The representatives of the participating States stressed the high political significance of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and of the process initiated by it as well as of the ways and means

it provides for States to further their efforts to increase security, develop co-operation and enhance mutual understanding in Europe. They therefore reaffirmed their commitment to the process of the CSCE and emphasized the importance of the implementation of all the provisions and the respect for all the principles of the Final Act by each of them as being essential for the development of this process. Furthermore, they stressed the importance they attach to security and genuine detente, while deploring the deterioration of the international situation since the Belgrade Meeting 1977.

Accordingly, the participating States agreed that renewed efforts should be made to give full effect to the Final Act through concrete action, unilateral, bilateral and multilateral, in order to restore trust and confidence between the participating States which would permit a substantial improvement in their mutual relations. They considered that the future of the CSCE process required balanced progress in all sections of the Final Act.

In accordance with the mandate provided for in the Final Act and the Agenda of the Madrid Meeting, the representatives of the participating States held a thorough exchange of views both on the implementation of the provisions of the Final Act and of the tasks defined by the Conference, as well as, in the context of the questions dealt with by the latter, on the deepening of their mutual relations, the improvement of security and the development of co-operation in Europe, and the development of the process of detente in the future.

It was confirmed that the thorough exchange of views constitutes in itself a valuable contribution towards the achievement of the aims set by the CSCE. In this context, it was agreed that these aims can only be attained by continuous implementation, unilaterally, bilaterally and multilaterally, of all the provisions and by respect for all the principles of the Final Act.

During this exchange of views, different and at times contradictory opinions were expressed as to the degree of implementation of the Final Act reached so far by participating States. While certain progress was noted, concern was expressed at the serious deficiencies in the implementation of this document.

Critical assessments from different viewpoints were given as to the application of and respect for the principles of the Final Act. Serious violations of a number of these principles were deplored during these assessments. Therefore, the participating States, at times represented at a higher level, considered it necessary to state, at various stages of the Meeting, that strict application of and respect for these principles, in all their aspects, are essential for the improvement of mutual relations between the participating States.

The necessity was also stressed that the relations of the participating States with all other States should be conducted in the spirit of these principles.

Concern was expressed about the continued lack of confidence among participating States.

Concern was also expressed as to the spread of terrorism.

The implementation of the provisions of the Final Act concerning Confidence-Building Measures, Co-operation in the field of Economics, of Science and Technology and of Environment, as well as Co-operation in Humanitarian and other fields was thoroughly discussed. It was considered that the numerous possibilities offered by the Final Act had not been sufficiently utilized. Questions relating to Security and Co-operation in the Mediterranean were also discussed.

The participating States reaffirmed their commitment to the continuation of the CSCE process as agreed to in the chapter on the Follow-up to the Conference contained in the Final Act.

The representatives of the participating States took note of the reports of the meetings of experts and of the "Scientific Forum", and in the course of their deliberations took the results of these meetings into account.

The representatives of the participating States examined all the proposals submitted concerning the above questions and agreed on the following:

QUESTIONS RELATING TO SECURITY IN EUROPE

The participating States express their determination

- to exert new efforts to make detente an effective, as well as continuing increasingly viable and comprehensive process, universal in scope, as undertaken under the Final Act;
- to seek solutions to outstanding problems through peaceful means;
- to fulfil consistently all the provisions under the Final Act and, in particular, strictly and unreservedly to respect and put into practice all the ten principles contained in the Declaration on Principles Guiding Relations between Participating States, irrespective of their political, economic or social systems, as well as of their size, geographical location or level of economic development, including their commitment to conduct their relations with all other States in the spirit of these principles;
- to develop relations of mutual co-operation, friendship and confidence, refraining from any action which, being contrary to the Final Act, might impair such relations;
- to encourage genuine efforts to implement the Final Act;
- to exert genuine efforts towards containing an increasing arms build-up as well as towards strengthening confidence and security and promoting disarmament.

They reaffirm their determination fully to respect and apply these principles and accordingly, to promote by all means, both in law and practice, their increased effectiveness. They consider that one such means could be to give legislative expression - in forms appropriate to practices and procedures specific to each country - to the ten principles set forth in the Final Act.

They recognize it as important that treaties and agreements concluded by participating States reflect and be consonant with the relevant principles and, where appropriate, refer to them.

The participating States reaffirm the need that refraining from the threat or use of force, as a norm of international life, should be strictly and effectively observed. To this end they stress their duty, under the relevant provisions of the Final Act, to act accordingly.

The participating States condemn terrorism, including terrorism in international relations, as endangering or taking innocent human lives or otherwise jeopardizing human rights and fundamental freedoms, and emphasize the necessity to take resolute measures to combat it. They express their determination to take effective measures for the prevention and suppression of acts of terrorism, both at the national level and through international co-operation including appropriate bilateral and multilateral agreements, and accordingly to broaden and reinforce mutual co-operation to combat such acts. They agree to do so in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, the United Nations Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States and the Helsinki Final Act.

In the context of the combat against acts of terrorism, they will take all appropriate measures in preventing their respective territories from being used for the preparation, organization or commission of terrorist activities, including those directed against other participating States and their citizens. This also includes measures to prohibit on their

territories illegal activities of persons, groups and organizations that instigate, organize or engage in the perpetration of acts of terrorism.

The participating States confirm that they will refrain from direct or indirect assistance to terrorist activities or to subversive or other activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the regime of another participating State. Accordingly, they will refrain, inter alia, from financing, encouraging, fomenting or tolerating any such activities.

They express their determination to do their utmost to assure necessary security to all official representatives and persons who participate on their territories in activities within the scope of diplomatic, consular or other official relations.

They emphasize that all the participating States recognize in the Final Act the universal significance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for which is an essential factor for the peace, justice and well-being necessary to ensure the development of friendly relations and co-operation among themselves, as among all States.

The participating States stress their determination to promote and encourage the effective exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms, all of which derive from the inherent dignity of the human person and are essential for his free and full development, and to assure constant and tangible progress in accordance with the Final Act, aiming at further and steady development in this field in all participating States, irrespective of their political, economic and social systems.

They similarly stress their determination to develop their laws and regulations in the field of civil, political, economic, social, cultural and other human rights and fundamental freedoms; they also emphasize their determination to ensure the effective exercise of these rights and freedoms.

They recall the right of the individual to know and act upon his rights and duties in the field of human rights and fundamental freedoms, as embodied in the Final Act, and will take the necessary action in their respective countries to effectively ensure this right.

The participating States reaffirm that they will recognize, respect and furthermore agree to take the action necessary to ensure the freedom of the individual to profess and practise, alone or in community with others, religion or belief acting in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience.

In this context, they will consult, whenever necessary, the religious faiths, institutions and organizations, which act within the constitutional framework of their respective countries.

They will favourably consider applications by religious communities of believers practising or prepared to practise their faith within the constitutional framework of their States, to be granted the status provided for in their respective countries for religious faiths, institutions and organizations.

They stress also the importance of constant progress in ensuring the respect for and actual enjoyment of the rights of persons belonging to national minorities as well as protecting their legitimate interests as provided for in the Final Act.

They stress the importance of ensuring equal rights of men and women; accordingly, they agree to take all actions necessary to promote equally effective participation of men and women in political, economic, social and cultural life.

The participating States will ensure the right of workers freely to establish and join trade unions, the right of trade unions freely to exercise their activities and other rights as laid down in relevant international instruments. They note that these rights will be exercised in compliance with the law of the State and in conformity with the State's obligations

under international law. They will encourage, as appropriate, direct contacts and communication among such trade unions and their representatives.

They reaffirm that governments, institutions, organizations and persons have a relevant and positive role to play in contributing toward the achievement of the above-mentioned aims of their co-operation.

They reaffirm the particular significance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants on Human Rights and other relevant international instruments of their joint and separate efforts to stimulate and develop universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; they call on all participating States to act in conformity with those international instruments and on those participating States, which have not yet done so, to consider the possibility of acceding to the covenants.

They agree to give favourable consideration to the use of bilateral round-table meetings, held on a voluntary basis, between delegations composed by each participating State to discuss issues of human rights and fundamental freedoms in accordance with an agreed agenda in a spirit of mutual respect with a view to achieving greater understanding and co-operation based on the provisions of the Final Act.

They decide to convene a meeting of experts of the participating States on questions concerning respect, in their States, for human rights and fundamental freedoms, in all their aspects, as embodied in the Final Act.

Upon invitation of the Government of Canada, the meeting of experts will be held in Ottawa, beginning on 7 May 1985. It will draw up conclusions and recommendations to be submitted to the governments of all participating States.

The meeting will be preceded by a preparatory meeting which will be held in Ottawa upon the invitation of the Government of Canada, starting on 23 April 1985.

In conformity with the recommendation contained in the Report of the Montreux Meeting of Experts, another meeting of experts of the participating States will be convened, at the invitation of the Government of Greece. It will take place in Athens and will commence on 21 March 1984, with the purpose of pursuing, on the basis of the Final Act, the examination of a generally acceptable method for the peaceful settlement of disputes aimed at complementing existing methods. The meeting will take into account the common approach set forth in the above-mentioned report.

Recalling the right of any participating State to belong or not to belong to international organizations, to be or not to be a party to bilateral or multilateral treaties including the right to be or not to be a party to treaties of alliance, and also the right to neutrality, the participating States take note of the declaration of the Government of the Republic of Malta in which it stated that, as an effective contribution to detente, peace and security in the Mediterranean region, the Republic of Malta is a neutral State adhering to a policy of non-alignment. They call upon all States to respect that declaration.

Conference on Confidence- and Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe

The participating States,

Recalling the provisions of the Final Act according to which they recognize the interest of all of them in efforts aimed at lessening military confrontation and promoting disarmament,

Have agreed to convene a Conference on Confidence- and Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

The aim of the Conference is, as a substantial and integral part of the multilateral process initiated by the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, with the participation of all the States signatories of the Final Act, to undertake, in stages, new, effective and concrete actions designed to make progress in strengthening confidence and security and in achieving disarmament, so as to give effect and expression to the duty of States to refrain from the threat or use of force in their mutual relations.

Thus the Conference will begin a process of which the first stage will be devoted to the negotiation and adoption of a set of mutually complementary confidence- and security-building measures designed to reduce the risk of military confrontation in Europe.

The first stage of the Conference will be held in Stockholm commencing on 17 January 1984.

On the basis of equality of rights, balance and reciprocity, equal respect for the security interests of all CSCE participating States, and of their respective obligations concerning confidence- and security-building measures and disarmament in Europe, these confidence- and security-building measures will cover the whole of Europe as well as the adjoining sea area*/

---

*/ In this context, the notion of adjoining sea area is understood to refer also to ocean areas adjoining Europe.

and air space. They will be of military significance and politically binding and will be provided with adequate forms of verification which correspond to their content.

As far as the adjoining sea area*/ and air space is concerned, the measures will be applicable to the military activities of all the participating States taking place there whenever these activities affect security in Europe as well as constitute a part of activities taking place within the whole of Europe as referred to above, which they will agree to notify. Necessary specifications will be made through the negotiations on the confidence- and security-building measures at the Conference.

Nothing in the definition of the zone given above will diminish obligations already undertaken under the Final Act. The confidence- and security-building measures to be agreed upon at the Conference will also be applicable in all areas covered by any of the provisions in the Final Act relating to confidence-building measures and certain aspects of security and disarmament.

The provisions established by the negotiators will come into force in the forms and according to the procedure to be agreed upon by the Conference.

Taking into account the above-mentioned aim of the Conference, the next follow-up meeting of the participating States of the CSCE, to be held in Vienna, commencing on 4 November 1986, will assess the progress achieved during the first stage of the Conference.

Taking into account the relevant provisions of the Final Act, and having reviewed the results achieved by the first stage of the Conference, and also in the light of other relevant negotiations on security and disarmament affecting Europe, a future CSCE follow-up meeting will consider

---

*/ In this context, the notion of adjoining sea area is understood to refer also to ocean areas adjoining Europe.

ways and appropriate means for the participating States to continue their efforts for security and disarmament in Europe, including the question of supplementing the present mandate for the next stage of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

A preparatory meeting, charged with establishing the agenda, time-table and other organizational modalities for the first stage of the Conference, will be held in Helsinki, commencing on 25 October 1983. Its duration shall not exceed three weeks.

The rules of procedure, the working methods and the scale of distribution for the expenses valid for the CSCE will, mutatis mutandis, be applied to the Conference and to the preparatory meeting referred to in the preceding paragraph. The services of a technical secretariat will be provided by the host country.

CO-OPERATION IN THE FIELD OF ECONOMICS, OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND OF THE ENVIRONMENT

The participating States consider that the implementation of all provisions of the Final Act and full respect for the principles guiding relations among them set out therein are an essential basis for the development of co-operation among them in the field of economics, of science and technology and of the environment. At the same time they reaffirm their conviction that co-operation in these fields contributes to the reinforcement of peace and security in Europe and in the world as a whole. In this spirit they reiterate their resolve to pursue and intensify such co-operation between one another, irrespective of their economic and social systems.

The participating States confirm their interest in promoting adequate, favourable conditions in order further to develop trade and industrial co-operation among them, in particular by fully implementing all provisions of the second chapter of the Final Act, so as to make greater use of the possibilities created by their economic, scientific and technical potential. In this context and taking into consideration the efforts already made unilaterally, bilaterally and multilaterally in order to overcome all kinds of obstacles to trade, they reaffirm their intention to make further efforts aimed at reducing or progressively eliminating all kinds of obstacles to the development of trade.

Taking account of the activities of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) already carried out in the field of all kinds of obstacles to trade, they recommend that further work on this subject be directed in particular towards identifying these obstacles and examining them with a view to finding means for their reduction or progressive elimination, in order to contribute to harmonious development of their economic relations.

On the basis of the provisions of the Final Act concerning business contacts and facilities the participating States declare their intention to make efforts to enable business negotiations and activities to be carried out more efficiently and expeditiously and further to create conditions facilitating closer contacts between representatives and experts of seller firms on the one hand and buyer as well as user firms on the other at all stages of transaction. They will also further other forms of operational contacts between sellers and users such as the holding of technical symposia and demonstrations and after-sales training or requalification courses for technical staff of user firms and organizations.

They also agree to take measures further to develop and improve facilities and working conditions for representatives of foreign firms and organizations on their territory, including telecommunications facilities for representatives of such firms and organizations, as well as to develop these and other amenities for temporarily resident staff including particularly site personnel. They will endeavour further to take measures to speed up as far as possible procedures for the registration of foreign firms' representations and offices as well as for granting entry visas to business representatives.

The participating States declare their intention to ensure the regular publication and dissemination, as rapidly as possible, of economic and commercial information compiled in such a way as to facilitate the appreciation of market opportunities and thus to contribute effectively to the process of developing international trade and industrial co-operation.

To this end and in order to make further progress in achieving the aims laid down in the relevant provisions of the Final Act they intend to intensify their efforts to improve the comparability, comprehensiveness and clarity of their economic and commercial statistics, in particular by adopting where necessary the following measures: by accompanying their economic and trade statistics by adequately defined summary indices based

wherever possible on constant values; by publishing their interim statistics whenever technically possible at least on a quarterly basis; by publishing their statistical compilations in sufficient detail to achieve the aims referred to above, in particular by using for their foreign trade statistics a product breakdown permitting the identification of particular products for purposes of market analysis; by striving to have their economic and trade statistics no less comprehensive than those previously published by the State concerned.

They further express their willingness to co-operate towards the early completion of work in the appropriate United Nations bodies on the harmonization and alignment of statistical nomenclatures.

The participating States further recognize the usefulness of making economic and commercial information existing in other participating States readily available to enterprises and firms in their countries through appropriate channels.

The participating States, conscious of the need further to improve the conditions conducive to a more efficient functioning of institutions and firms acting in the field of marketing, will promote a more active exchange of knowledge and techniques required for effective marketing, and will encourage more intensive relations among such institutions and firms. They agree to make full use of the possibilities offered by the ECE to further their co-operation in this field.

The participating States note the increasing frequency in their economic relations of compensation transactions in all their forms. They recognize that a useful role can be played by such transactions, concluded on a mutually acceptable basis. At the same time they recognize that problems can be created by the linkage in such transactions between purchases and sales.

Taking account of the studies of the ECE already carried out in this field, they recommend that further work on this subject be directed in particular towards identifying such problems and examining ways of solving them in order to contribute to a harmonious development of their economic relations.

The participating States recognize that the expansion of industrial co-operation, on the basis of their mutual interest and motivated by economic considerations, can contribute to the further development and diversification of their economic relations and to a wider utilization of modern technology.

They note the useful role bilateral agreements on economic, industrial and technical co-operation, including where appropriate, those of a long-term nature can play. They also express their willingness to promote favourable conditions for the development of industrial co-operation among competent organizations, enterprises and firms. To this end and with a view to facilitating the identification of new possibilities for industrial co-operation projects they recognize the desirability of further developing and improving the conditions for business activities and the exchange of economic and commercial information among competent organizations, enterprises and firms including small and medium-sized enterprises.

They also note that, if it is in the mutual interest of potential partners, new forms of industrial co-operation can be envisaged, including those with organizations, institutions and firms of third countries.

They recommend that the ECE pursue and continue to pay particular attention to its activities in the field of industrial co-operation, inter alia by further directing its efforts towards examining ways of promoting favourable conditions for the development of co-operation in this field, including the organization of symposia and seminars.

The participating States declare their readiness to continue their efforts aiming at a wider participation by small and medium-size enterprises in trade and industrial co-operation. Aware of the problems particularly affecting such enterprises, the participating States will endeavour further to improve the conditions dealt with in the preceding paragraphs in order to facilitate the operations of these enterprises in the above-mentioned fields. The participating States further recommend that the ECE develop its special studies pertaining to these problems.

The participating States recognize the increasing importance of co-operation in the field of energy, inter alia that of a long-term nature, on both a bilateral and multilateral basis. Welcoming the results so far achieved through such endeavours and in particular the work carried out by the ECE they express their support for continuing the co-operation pursued by the Senior Advisers to ECE Governments on Energy aiming at the fulfilment of all parts of their mandate.

The participating States reaffirm their interest in reducing and preventing technical barriers to trade and welcome the increased co-operation in this field, inter alia the work of the Government Officials Responsible for Standardization Policies in the ECE. They will encourage the conclusion of international certification arrangements covering where appropriate the mutual acceptance of certification systems providing mutually satisfactory guarantees.

The participating States recommend that appropriate action be taken in order to facilitate the use and enlarge the scope of arbitration as an instrument for settling disputes in international trade and industrial co-operation. They recommend in particular the application of the provisions of the United Nations Convention on Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards of 1958 as well as a wider recourse to the arbitration rules elaborated by the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. They also advocate that parties should, on the basis of the provisions of the

Final Act, be allowed freedom in the choice of arbitrators and the place of arbitration, including the choice of arbitrators and the place of arbitration in a third country.

The participating States recognize the important role of scientific and technical progress in the economic and social development of all countries in particular those which are developing from an economic point of view. Taking into account the objectives which countries or institutions concerned pursue in their bilateral and multilateral relations they underline the importance of further developing, on the basis of reciprocal advantage and on the basis of mutual agreement and other arrangements, the forms and methods of co-operation in the field of science and technology provided for in the Final Act, for instance international programmes and co-operative projects, while utilizing also various forms of contacts, including direct and individual contacts among scientists and specialists as well as contacts and communications among interested organizations, scientific and technological institutions and enterprises.

In this context they recognize the value of an improved exchange and dissemination of information concerning scientific and technical developments as a means of facilitating, on the basis of mutual advantage, the study and the transfer of, as well as access to scientific and technical achievements in fields of co-operation agreed between interested parties.

The participating States recommend that in the field of science and technology the ECE should give due attention, through appropriate ways and means, to the elaboration of studies and practical projects for the development of co-operation among member countries.

Furthermore, the participating States, aware of the relevant part of the Report of the "Scientific Forum", agree to encourage the development of scientific co-operation in the field of agriculture at bilateral, multilateral and sub-regional levels, with the aim, inter alia, of improving livestock and

plant breeding and ensuring optimum use and conservation of water resources. To this end, they will promote further co-operation among research institutions and centres in their countries, through the exchange of information, the joint implementation of research programmes, the organization of meetings among scientists and specialists, and other methods.

The participating States invite the ECE and other competent international organizations to support the implementation of these activities and to examine the possibilities of providing a wider exchange of scientific and technological information in the field of agriculture.

The participating States welcome with satisfaction the important steps taken to strengthen co-operation within the framework of the ECE in the field of the environment, including the High-Level Meeting on the Protection of the Environment (13-16 November 1979). Taking due account of work undertaken or envisaged in other competent international organizations, they recommend the continuation of efforts in this field, including, inter alia,

- giving priority to the effective implementation of the provisions of the Resolution on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution adopted at the High-Level Meeting,
- the early ratification of the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution signed at the High-Level Meeting,
- implementation of the Recommendations contained in the Declaration on Low and Non-Waste Technology and Reutilization and Recycling of Wastes,
- implementation of Decisions B and C of the thirty-fifth session of the ECE concerning the Declaration of Policy on Prevention and Control of Water Pollution, including transboundary pollution,
- support in carrying out the programme of work of the ECE concerning the protection of the environment, including, inter alia, the work under way in the field of the protection of flora and fauna.

In the context of the provisions of the Final Act concerning migrant labour in Europe, the participating States note that recent developments in the world economy have affected the situation of migrant workers. In this connection, the participating States express their wish that host countries and countries of origin, guided by a spirit of mutual interest and co-operation, intensify their contacts with a view to improving further the general situation of migrant workers and their families, inter alia the protection of their human rights including their economic, social and cultural rights while taking particularly into account the special problems of second generation migrants. They will also endeavour to provide or promote, where reasonable demand exists, adequate teaching of the language and culture of the countries of origin.

The participating States recommend that, among other measures for facilitating the social and economic reintegration of returning migrant labour, the payment of pensions as acquired or established under the social security system to which such workers have been admitted in the host country should be ensured by appropriate legislative means or reciprocal agreements.

The participating States further recognize the importance for their economic development of promoting the exchange of information and experience on training for management staff. To this end they recommend the organization, in an appropriate existing framework and with the help of interested organizations such as, for example, the ECE and the International Labour Organisation, of a symposium of persons responsible for services and institutions specializing in management training for administrations and enterprises with a view to exchanging information on training problems and methods, comparing experiences and encouraging the development of relations among the centres concerned.

The participating States welcome the valuable contribution made by the ECE to the multilateral implementation of the provisions of the Final Act pertaining to co-operation in the fields of economics, of science and

technology and of the environment. Aware of the potential of the ECE for intensifying co-operation in these fields, they recommend the fullest use of the existing mechanisms and resources in order to continue and consolidate the implementation of the relevant provisions of the Final Act in the interest of its member countries, including those within the ECE region which are developing from an economic point of view.

The participating States, bearing in mind their will expressed in the provisions of the Final Act, reiterate the determination of each of them to promote stable and equitable international economic relations in the mutual interest of all States and, in this spirit, to participate equitably in promoting and strengthening economic co-operation with the developing countries in particular the least developed among them. They also note the usefulness, inter alia, of identifying and executing, in co-operation with developing countries, concrete projects, with a view to contributing to economic development in these countries.

They also declare their readiness to contribute to common efforts towards the establishment of a new international economic order and the implementation of the Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, as adopted. They recognize the importance of the launching of mutually beneficial and adequately prepared global negotiations relating to international economic co-operation for development.

QUESTIONS RELATING TO SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

The participating States, bearing in mind that security in Europe, considered in the broader context of world security, is closely linked to security in the Mediterranean area as a whole, reaffirm their intention to contribute to peace, security and justice in the Mediterranean region.

They further express their will

- to take positive steps towards lessening tensions and strengthening stability, security and peace in the Mediterranean and, to this end, to intensify efforts towards finding just, viable and lasting solutions, through peaceful means, to outstanding crucial problems, without resort to force or other means incompatible with the Principles of the Final Act, so as to promote confidence and security and make peace prevail in the region;
- to take measures designed to increase confidence and security;
- to develop good neighbourly relations with all States in the region, with due regard to reciprocity, and in the spirit of the principles contained in the Declaration on Principles Guiding Relations between Participating States of the Final Act;
- to study further the possibility of ad hoc meetings of Mediterranean States aimed at strengthening security and intensifying co-operation in the Mediterranean.

In addition the participating States will, within the framework of the implementation of the Valletta report, consider the possibilities offered by new transport infrastructure developments to facilitate new commercial and industrial exchanges, as well as by the improvement of existing transport networks, and by a wider co-ordination of transport investments between interested parties. In this context they recommend that a study be undertaken, within the framework of the ECE, in order to establish the current and

potential transport flows in the Mediterranean involving the participating States and other States of this region taking account of the current work in this field. They will further consider the question of introducing or extending, in accordance with the existing IMO regulations, the use of suitable techniques for aids to maritime navigation, principally in straits.

They further note with satisfaction the results of the Meeting of Experts held in Valletta on the subject of economic, scientific and cultural co-operation within the framework of the Mediterranean Chapter of the Final Act. They reaffirm the conclusions and recommendations of the report of this Meeting and agree that they will be guided accordingly. They also take note of efforts under way aiming at implementing them as appropriate. To this end, the participating States agree to convene from 16 to 26 October 1984 a seminar to be held at Venice at the invitation of the Government of Italy, to review the initiatives already undertaken, or envisaged, in all the sectors outlined in the report of the Valletta Meeting and stimulate, where necessary, broader developments in these sectors.

Representatives of the competent international organizations and representatives of the non-participating Mediterranean States will be invited to this Seminar in accordance with the rules and practices adopted at the Valletta Meeting.*/

---

*/ The organization of the Venice Seminar is set forth in the Chairman's statement of 6 September 1983 (see Annex I).

CO-OPERATION IN HUMANITARIAN AND OTHER FIELDS

The participating States,

Recalling the introductory sections of the Chapter on Co-operation in Humanitarian and other Fields of the Final Act including those concerning the development of mutual understanding between them and détente and those concerning progress in cultural and educational exchanges, broader dissemination of information, contacts between people and the solution of humanitarian problems,

Resolving to pursue and expand co-operation in these fields and to achieve a fuller utilization of the possibilities offered by the Final Act,

Agree now to implement the following:

Human Contacts

The participating States will favourably deal with applications relating to contacts and regular meetings on the basis of family ties, reunification of families and marriage between citizens of different States and will decide upon them in the same spirit.

They will decide upon these applications in emergency cases for family meetings as expeditiously as possible, for family reunification and for marriage between citizens of different States in normal practice within six months and for other family meetings within gradually decreasing time limits.

They confirm that the presentation or renewal of applications in these cases will not modify the rights and obligations of the applicants or of members of their families concerning inter alia employment, housing, residence status, family support, access to social, economic or educational benefits, as well as any other rights and obligations flowing from the laws and regulations of the respective participating State.

The participating States will provide the necessary information on the procedures to be followed by the applicants in these cases and on the regulations to be observed, as well as, upon the applicant's request, provide the relevant forms.

They will, where necessary, gradually reduce fees charged in connection with these applications, including those for visas and passports, in order to bring them to a moderate level in relation to the average monthly income in the respective participating State.

Applicants will be informed as expeditiously as possible of the decision that has been reached. In case of refusal applicants will also be informed of their right to renew applications after reasonably short intervals.

The participating States reaffirm their commitment fully to implement the provisions regarding diplomatic and other official missions and consular posts of other participating States contained in relevant multilateral or bilateral conventions, and to facilitate the normal functioning of those missions. Access by visitors to these missions will be assured with due regard to the necessary requirements of security of these missions.

They also reaffirm their willingness to take, within their competence, reasonable steps, including necessary security measures, when appropriate, to ensure satisfactory conditions for activities within the framework of mutual co-operation on their territory, such as sporting and cultural events, in which citizens of other participating States take part.

The participating States will endeavour, where appropriate, to improve the conditions relating to legal, consular and medical assistance for citizens of other participating States temporarily on their territory for personal or professional reasons, taking due account of relevant multilateral or bilateral conventions or agreements.

They will further implement the relevant provisions of the Final Act, so that religious faiths, institutions, organizations and their representatives can, in the field of their activity, develop contacts and meetings among themselves and exchange information.

The participating States will encourage contacts and exchanges among young people and foster the broadening of co-operation among their youth organizations. They will favour the holding among young people and youth organizations of educational, cultural and other comparable events and activities. They will also favour the study of problems relating to the younger generation. The participating States will further the development of individual or collective youth tourism, when necessary on the basis of arrangements, inter alia by encouraging the granting of suitable facilities by the transport authorities and tourist organizations of the participating States or such facilities as those offered by the railway authorities participating in the "Inter-Rail" system.

Information

The participating States will further encourage the freer and wider dissemination of printed matter, periodical and non-periodical, imported from other participating States, as well as an increase in the number of places where these publications are on public sale. These publications will also be accessible in reading rooms in large public libraries and similar institutions.

In particular, to facilitate the improvement of dissemination of printed information, the participating States will encourage contacts and negotiations between their competent firms and organizations with a view to concluding long-term agreements and contracts designed to increase the quantities and number of titles of newspapers and other publications imported from other participating States. They consider it desirable that the retail prices of foreign publications are not excessive in relation to prices in their country of origin.

They confirm their intention, according to the relevant provisions of the Final Act, to further extend the possibilities for the public to take out subscriptions.

They will favour the further expansion of co-operation among mass media and their representatives, especially between the editorial staffs of press agencies, newspapers, radio and television organizations as well as film companies. They will encourage a more regular exchange of news, articles, supplements and broadcasts as well as the exchange of editorial staff for better knowledge of respective practices. On the basis of reciprocity, they will improve the material and technical facilities provided for permanently or temporarily accredited television and radio reporters. Moreover, they will facilitate direct contacts among journalists as well as contacts within the framework of professional organizations.

They will decide without undue delay upon visa applications from journalists and re-examine within a reasonable time frame applications which have been refused. Moreover, journalists wishing to travel for personal reasons and not for the purpose of reporting shall enjoy the same treatment as other visitors from their country of origin.

They will grant permanent correspondents and members of their families living with them multiple entry and exit visas valid for one year.

The participating States will examine the possibility of granting, where necessary on the basis of bilateral arrangements, accreditation and related facilities to journalists from other participating States who are permanently accredited in third countries.

They will facilitate travel by journalists from other participating States within their territories, inter alia by taking concrete measures where necessary, to afford them opportunities to travel more extensively, with the exception of areas closed for security reasons. They will inform journalists in advance, whenever possible, if new areas are closed for security reasons.

They will further increase the possibilities and, when necessary, improve the conditions for journalists from other participating States to establish and maintain personal contacts and communication with their sources.

They will, as a rule, authorize radio and television journalists, at their request, to be accompanied by their own sound and film technicians and to use their own equipment.

Similarly, journalists may carry with them reference material, including personal notes and files, to be used strictly for their professional purposes.*/

---

*/ In this context it is understood that import of printed matter may be subject to local regulations which will be applied with due regard to the journalists' need for adequate working material.

The participating States will, where necessary, facilitate the establishment and operation, in their capitals, of press centres or institutions performing the same functions, open to the national and foreign press with suitable working facilities for the latter.

They will also consider further ways and means to assist journalists from other participating States and thus to enable them to resolve practical problems they may encounter.

Co-operation and Exchanges in the Field of Culture

They will endeavour, by taking appropriate steps, to make the relevant information concerning possibilities offered by bilateral cultural agreements and programmes available to interested persons, institutions and non-governmental organizations, thus facilitating their effective implementation.

The participating States will further encourage wider dissemination of and access to books, films and other forms and means of cultural expression from other participating States, to this end improving by appropriate means, on bilateral and multilateral bases, the conditions for international commercial and non-commercial exchange of their cultural goods, *inter alia* by gradually lowering customs duties on these items.

The participating States will endeavour to encourage the translation, publication and dissemination of works in the sphere of literature and other fields of cultural activity from other participating States, especially those produced in less widely spoken languages, by facilitating co-operation between publishing houses, in particular through the exchange of lists of books which might be translated as well as of other relevant information.

They will contribute to the development of contacts, co-operation and joint projects among the participating States regarding the protection, preservation and recording of historical heritage and monuments and the relationship between man, environment and this heritage; they express their interest in the possibility of convening an inter-governmental conference on these matters within the framework of UNESCO.

The participating States will encourage their radio and television organizations to continue developing the presentation of the cultural and artistic achievements of other participating States on the basis of bilateral and multilateral arrangements between these organizations, providing inter alia for exchanges of information on productions, for the broadcasting of shows and programmes from other participating States, for co-productions, for the invitation of guest conductors and directors, as well as for the provision of mutual assistance to cultural film teams.

At the invitation of the Government of Hungary a "Cultural Forum" will take place in Budapest, commencing on 15 October 1985. It will be attended by leading personalities in the field of culture from the participating States. The "Forum" will discuss interrelated problems concerning creation, dissemination and co-operation, including the promotion and expansion of contacts and exchanges in the different fields of culture. A representative of UNESCO will be invited to present to the "Forum" the views of that organization. The "Forum" will be prepared by a meeting of experts, the duration of which will not exceed two weeks and which will be held upon the invitation of the Government of Hungary in Budapest, commencing 21 November 1984.

Co-operation and Exchanges in the Field of Education

The participating States will promote the establishment of governmental and non-governmental arrangements and agreements in education and science, to be carried out with the participation of educational or other competent institutions.

The participating States will contribute to the further improvement of exchanges of students, teachers and scholars and their access to each other's educational, cultural and scientific institutions, and also their access to open information material in accordance with the laws and regulations prevailing in each country. In this context, they will facilitate travel by scholars, teachers and students within the receiving State, the establishment by them of contacts with their colleagues, and will also encourage libraries, higher education establishments and similar institutions in their territories to make catalogues and lists of open archival material available to scholars, teachers and students from other participating States.

They will encourage a more regular exchange of information about scientific training programmes, courses and seminars for young scientists and facilitate a wider participation in these activities of young scientists from different participating States. They will call upon the appropriate national and international organizations and institutions to give support, where appropriate, to the realization of these training activities.

The representatives of the participating States noted the usefulness of the work done during the "Scientific Forum" held in Hamburg, Federal Republic of Germany, from 18 February to 3 March 1980. Taking into

account the results of the "Scientific Forum", the particpating States invited international organizations as well as the scientific organizations and scientists of the participating States to give due consideration to its conclusions and recommendations.

The participating States will favour widening the possibilities of teaching and studying less widely spread or studied European languages. They will, to this end, stimulate, within their competence, the organization of and attendance at summer university and other courses, the granting of scholarships for translators and the reinforcement of linguistic faculties including, in case of need, the provision of new facilities for studying these languages.

The participating States express their readiness to intensify the exchange, among them and within competent international organizations, of teaching materials, school textbooks, maps, bibliographies and other educational material, in order to promote better mutual knowledge and facilitate a fuller presentation of their respective countries.

FOLLOW-UP TO THE CONFERENCE

In conformity with the relevant provisions of the Final Act and with their resolve and commitment to continue the multilateral process initiated by the CSCE, the participating States will hold further meetings regularly among their representatives.

The third of these meetings will be held in Vienna commencing on 4 November 1986.

The agenda, working programme and modalities of the main Madrid Meeting will be applied mutatis mutandis to the main Vienna Meeting, unless other decisions on these questions are taken by the preparatory meeting mentioned below.

For the purpose of making the adjustments to the agenda, working programme and modalities of the main Madrid Meeting, a preparatory meeting will be held in Vienna commencing on 23 September 1986. It is understood that in this context adjustments concern those items requiring change as a result of the change in date and place, the drawing of lots, and the mention of the other meetings held in conformity with the decisions of the Madrid Meeting 1980. The duration of the preparatory meeting shall not exceed two weeks.

The participating States further decide that in 1985, the tenth Anniversary of the signature of the Final Act of the CSCE will be duly commemorated in Helsinki.

The duration of the meetings mentioned in this document, unless otherwise agreed, should not exceed six weeks. The results of these meetings will be taken into account, as appropriate, at the Vienna Follow-up Meeting.

All the above-mentioned meetings will be held in conformity with Paragraph 4 of the Chapter on "Follow-up to the Conference" of the Final Act.

The Government of Spain is requested to transmit the present document to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to the Director-General of UNESCO and to the Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. The Government of Spain is also requested to transmit the present document to the Governments of the non-participating Mediterranean States.

The text of this document will be published in each participating State, which will disseminate it and make it known as widely as possible.

The representatives of the participating States express their profound gratitude to the people and Government of Spain for the excellent organization of the Madrid Meeting and warm hospitality extended to the delegations which participated in the Meeting.

Madrid, 6 September 1983

CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT

VENICE SEMINAR ON ECONOMIC, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL CO-OPERATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE RESULTS OF THE VALLETTA MEETING OF EXPERTS

The Seminar will open on Tuesday, 16 October 1984 at 10 a.m. in Venice, Italy. It will close on Friday, 26 October 1984.

The work of the Seminar, guided by a Co-ordinating Committee composed of the delegations of the participating States, will be divided among three Study Groups devoted to Economics, Science and Culture respectively.

The first three days of the Seminar will be devoted to six sessions of the Committee.

The first session of the Committee will be public and will be devoted to the opening of the Seminar, to be followed by an address by a representative of the host country.

The second session of the Committee will decide whether to hold further sessions of the participating States to guide the work of the Study Groups and to take any other decisions necessary for the Seminar.

The following four sessions of the Committee will be public and will be devoted to introductory statements by the representatives of the participating States which so desire (in an order selected by lot in advance) and to introductory statements by the representatives of the non-participating Mediterranean States and the international organizations invited. The statements should not exceed 10 minutes per delegation.

Beginning on the fourth day and for the following three and a half working days, simultaneous meetings of the three Study Groups will be held.

The last one and a half days will be devoted to three sessions of the Committee. Two sessions will decide upon the most appropriate use for the documentation presented in the course of the work concerning the specific sectors indicated in the Valletta Report, such as publication of the introductory statements and distribution of the studies to the relevant international organizations, and will take any other necessary decisions.

The final session of the Committee will be public and will be devoted to the official closing of the Seminar with an address by a representative of the host country.

The Chair at the opening and closing sessions of both the Committee and the Study Groups will be taken by a representative from the delegation of the host country. Selection of the successive chairmen by lot will then ensure daily rotation of the Chair, in French alphabetical order, among the representatives of the participating States.

Participation in the work of the Seminar by the non-participating Mediterranean States (Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Syria and Tunisia) and the international organizations (UNESCO, ECE, UNEP, WHO, ITU) invited will follow the rules and practices adopted at Valletta. This means, inter alia, that they will take part in the work of the three Study Groups and of the four sessions of the Committee on the second and third day as well as its opening and closing sessions.

Contributions, on the subjects for consideration in one or more of the working languages of the CSCE, may be sent through the proper channels - preferably not later than three months before the opening of the Seminar - to the Executive Secretary, who will circulate them to the other participating States, and to the non-participating Mediterranean States and to the international organizations which have notified their intention of taking part.

The Italian Government will designate the Executive Secretary of the Seminar. This designation should be agreed to by the participating States. The services of a technical secretariat will be provided by the host country.

Other rules of procedure, working methods and the scale of distribution for the expenses of the CSCE will, mutatis mutandis, be applied to the Seminar.

The arrangements outlined above will not constitute a precedent for any other CSCE forum.

Madrid, 6 September 1983

CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT

BERN MEETING OF EXPERTS ON HUMAN CONTACTS

The Chairman notes the absence of objection to the declaration made by the representative of Switzerland on 15 July 1983 extending an invitation by the Swiss Government to hold a meeting of experts on human contacts. Consequently, the Chairman notes that there is agreement to convene such a meeting to discuss the development of contacts among persons, institutions and organizations, with due account for the introductory part of the Chapter of the Final Act entitled Co-operation in Humanitarian and Other Fields and for the introductory part of section one (Human Contacts) of that Chapter, which reads inter alia as follows:

"The participating States,

Considering the development of contacts to be an important element in the strengthening of friendly relations and trust among peoples,

Affirming, in relation to their present effort to improve conditions in this area, the importance they attach to humanitarian considerations,

Desiring in this spirit to develop, with the continuance of détente, further efforts to achieve continuing progress in this field; ....."

The meeting will be convened in Bern, on 15 April 1986. Its duration will not exceed six weeks. The meeting will be preceded by preparatory consultations, which will be held in Bern commencing on 2 April 1986. The results of the meeting will be taken into account, as appropriate, at the Vienna Follow-up Meeting.

The Swiss Government will designate the Executive Secretary of the meeting. This designation should be agreed to by the participating States. The services of a technical secretariat will be provided by the host country.

Other rules of procedure, working methods and the scale of distribution for the expenses of the CSCE will be applied mutatis mutandis to the Bern meeting.

The Chairman notes further that this statement will be an annex to the concluding document of the Madrid Meeting and will be published with it.

Madrid, 6 September 1983